Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1991

The Relationship Between Internal Organizational Conflict, Authority Structure, and the Social Environment

Mary Ann Barham
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Work, Economy and Organizations Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Barham, Mary Ann, "The Relationship Between Internal Organizational Conflict, Authority Structure, and the Social Environment" (1991). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 4116.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.6000>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Mary Ann Barham for the
Master of Science in Sociology presented February 18, 1991.

Title: The Relationship Between Internal Organizational
Conflict, Authority Structure, and the Social
Environment.

APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

[REDACTED]
Kathryn Ann Farr, Chair

[REDACTED]
Nona Glazer

[REDACTED]
Robert C. Liebman

[REDACTED]
Larry S. Bowlden

This research seeks to answer the following questions:
Do feminist organizations have more internal conflicts than
other organizations? And, if so, why?

Three feminist organizations were compared with two
alternative organizations and a mainstream organization. I
hypothesized that the type of decision-making procedures
used by the organization (nonhierarchical, hierarchical or

mixed) and the amount of community support (financial, social, and/or emotional) the organization received were associated with the amount of overt internal organizational conflict in each organization. The relationship between organizational culture and internal conflicts was also examined.

The research was conducted in a Northwest metropolitan area. The six organizations, comparable in size and age, were all non-profit organizations which provided information and/or services on a continuous basis and relied on both paid staff and volunteers to provide these services. Data were gathered through open-ended interviews with administrators, board members, staff and volunteers at each organizations.

The dependent variable was internal organizational conflict. The independent variables were: a) authority structure, that is, the organization's decision-making procedures, and b) relationship to the social environment, that is, the interaction between the organization and the community. Organizational culture, the mediating variable, was defined as the expectations of organizational members, including but not limited to beliefs that: a) collective decision-making procedures would be used, b) relations among the staff and volunteers would be cohesive and supportive, and c) everyone would share the same "political" ideology.

Data analyses showed that:

1) The more hierarchical the organization's authority structure and the more integrated it was with the social environment, the fewer incidents of internal conflict it experienced and the less severe these incidents were in intensity and extent.

2) An organization's financial condition and its goals and philosophy were key indicators of its relationship to the social environment.

3) The following characteristics of organizational culture were associated with a high incidence of conflict: cohesive social relations, a "social change" ideology, cohesive social relations, and a board of directors involved in daily program operations.

4) The following characteristics of organizational culture were associated with a low incidence of conflict: ideological homogeneity and written policies, procedures, and job descriptions.

5) Feminist organizations with nonhierarchical authority structure and nonintegrated relationships to the social environment experienced more incidents of conflict and/or incidents higher in intensity and extent than feminist organizations with hierarchical authority structures and integrated relationships to the social environment.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT,
AUTHORITY STRUCTURE, AND THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

by

MARY ANN BARHAM

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SOCIOLOGY

Portland State University
1991

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of Mary Ann Barham presented February 18, 1991.

Kathryn Ann Farr, Chair

Nona Glazer

Robert C. Liebman

Larry S. Bowlden

APPROVED

Grant M. Farr, Chair, Department of Sociology

C. William Savery, Interim Vice Provost for Graduate Studies
and Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my family (Mark, Jesse, and Matthew) and my friends for their tolerance and support. I would also like to thank those who served on my thesis committee: Johanna Brenner, Nona Glazer, and Bob Liebman. Finally, I would like to dedicate this to all the women I worked with at KWRCC. They were a significant part of a wonderful, though traumatic, period in my life which prompted my return to graduate school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
PREFACE	ix

CHAPTER

I	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
	Feminist Organizations	2
	Alternative Organizations	7
	Factors Constraining Organizational Success	
	Factors Necessary for Organizational Success	
	Resource Mobilization Perspective on Social Movements	15
	The Impact of Institutionalization	
	Organizational Culture	23
	Organizational Conflict	25
	Summary	28
II	METHODOLOGY	30
	Description of Variables	30
	Dependent Variable	
	Independent Variables	
	Mediating Variable	
	Hypotheses	37

Operationalization of Variables	38
Authority Structure	
Relationship to Social Environment	
Organizational Culture	
Research Design	48
Sampling	
Data Gathering	
Problems with the Research	54
Data Gathering	
Biases re: Conflict	
Difficulties Operationalizing Variables	
Summary	57
III DESCRIPTION OF ORGANIZATIONS	58
The Feminist Organizations	58
Feminist Organization I	
Feminist Organization II	
Feminist Organization III	
The Alternative Organizations	67
Alternative Organization I	
Alternative Organization II	
The Mainstream Organization	75
Mainstream Organization I	
Summary of Organizations	77
IV ANALYSIS OF DATA	83
Organizational Conflict	84
Intensity, Extent and Type of Conflict	
Authority Structure	90
Relationship to the Social Environment	92
Economic Condition	
Community Support	
Goals and Philosophy	

	Organizational Culture	95
	Characteristics Associated with a High Incidence of Conflict	
	Characteristics Associated with a Low Incidence of Conflict	
	A Comparison of Organizations	107
	Speculations	109
	Urban vs. Suburban Location	
	Embeddedness in Another Institution	
	Staff Turnover	
	Controlling Conflict	
	Summary	113
V	CONCLUSION	115
	Summary of Analysis	115
	Critique of Resource Mobilization	116
	Recommendations for Feminist Organizations	118
	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	122
	APPENDICES	
A	QUESTIONNAIRES	127
B	INTRODUCTORY MATERIALS	135
C	NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED	138
D	DESCRIPTIONS OF CONFLICTS AT EACH ORGANIZATION	140

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Dimensions of a Peripheral Organization	43
II	Dimensions of a Semi-integrated Organization	43
III	Dimensions of an Integrated Organization	44
IV	Feminist Organization I	62
V	Feminist Organization II	65
VI	Feminist Organization III	68
VII	Alternative Organization I	73
VIII	Alternative Organization II	76
IX	Mainstream Organization I	78
X	Organization by Authority Structure by Relationship to Social Environment	80
XI	Authority Structure by Organizational Type	81
XII	Relationship to Social Environment by Organizational Type	81
XIII	Organizations by Authority Structure and Relationship to Social Environment	82
XIV	Incidence of Conflict by Organization	86
XV	Organizations by Rank Order of Incidence of Conflict	87
XVI	Incidents of Conflict by Intensity and Extent by Type of Conflict	89

XVII	Incidence of Reported Conflict by	
	Authority Structure	91
XVIII	Incidence of Reported Conflict by Relationship	
	to Social Environment	93

PREFACE

From 1981 to 1985, I was a volunteer and then, a paid staff member at a rape crisis center and battered women's shelter in a small Alaskan community. I resigned from this feminist organization after participating in six months of intense organizational conflict. Later, I realized that the organizational turmoil which I had witnessed was not unique to this feminist organization, and I decided that graduate training in sociology would help me understand it.

I wanted answers to the following questions: Do feminist organizations experience more internal conflict than other organizations? If so, why? All human relationships, in both small and large groups, involve conflict and it can be either constructive or destructive. Do feminist organizations experience more destructive internal conflict than other organizations? If so, why? Were feminist organizations unique in how they manage conflict? If so, what was special about them? Was it the personalities of the participants, their feminist ideology, or the nonhierarchical structure adopted by some feminist organizations? I was skeptical of the explanation that feminist beliefs or "women working together" was the cause

of internal conflict in such a large proportion of feminist organizations.

Reflecting on my own experience, I suspected that the turmoil I witnessed was associated with our decision-making procedures and the problems we faced being in a small conservative community. The organization mixed nonhierarchical and hierarchical forms of authority and much of the turmoil occurred when one director left and an interim director with a preference for hierarchical decision-making procedures was hired.

Studying sociology prompted me to ask additional questions: What structural variables are distinctive to feminist organizations? Do organizations similar to feminist organizations in decision-making procedures experience similar conflicts? As part of a social movement committed to ending male domination, most feminist organizations organized on the assumption that hierarchical decision-making procedures were antithetical to feminism.¹ Therefore, feminist organizations usually adopted nontraditional decision-making procedures. Secondly, because their goals included making drastic changes in the existing social institutions, feminist organizations rarely received much financial and social support from local governments or social agencies. Did these structural

¹See Kathy Ferguson's The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy for a discussion of feminism and bureaucracy.

factors account for the extent of internal conflicts in these organizations?

The research reported here was a qualitative study of six organizations: three feminist organizations (two battered women's shelters and a crisis line) and three nonfeminist organizations (a health clinic for the indigent, a community-run radio station, and a social service agency for seniors). I hypothesized that a) the type of decision-making procedures used by the organization (hierarchical, nonhierarchical or mixed) and b) the amount of community support received by the organization (financial, social, and/or emotional) was associated with the amount of internal conflict in the organization. I also recognized the following as possible secondary factors influencing the extent of conflict in organizations: consensus among members about appropriate workplace behavior and organizational goals, the role of the board of directors, and the participation of volunteers in decision-making procedures.

Chapter I reviews the literature about: a) rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters; b) organizations with nonhierarchical decision-making procedures; c) the resource mobilization perspective of social movements which emphasizes the importance of community resources in the survival of social movement organizations; and d) organizational conflict. Chapter II describes the dependent variable (internal organizational conflict), the independent

variables (decision-making procedures and community support), and the mediating variable (organizational culture); discusses how these variables were measured; and lists the research hypotheses. It also discusses the research design and the problems in carrying it out. Chapter III describes the six organizations I studied. Chapter IV presents the analysis of the research data. Chapter V summarizes the data analysis, critiques the use of the resource mobilization perspective to measure organizational success, and presents some recommendations for the reduction of destructive internal conflict in feminist organizations.

This research was more than an academic exercise. I hope that this study and its conclusions will improve feminist organizations' understanding of their potential problems and, consequently, prevent organizational disintegration. Furthermore, I anticipate using this information in future work with community organizations, helping them short-circuit organizational turmoil and possible self-destruction.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter I presents a theoretical framework for this research. The first section offers a history and discussion of feminist organizations, specifically rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters. The second section surveys literature on alternative organizations, including a discussion of Joyce Rothschild-Whitt's (1986) ideal type of an alternative organization. This ideal type was instrumental in the development of the independent variable, authority structure. The third section reviews the resource mobilization perspective on social movements which examines relationship to the social environment. Special attention is given to the impact of institutionalization on organizational conflicts. Many theorists find that internal conflicts are a frequent occurrence within alternative, collectivist-democratic organizations. The final section of the chapter examines the literature on organizational conflict.

FEMINIST ORGANIZATIONS ¹

The feminist organizations studied were shaped by the women's liberation movement that emerged in the late 1960s. This movement developed from women's dissatisfaction about their roles in the social movements of the early and mid-1960s (e.g. the "New Left,"² the civil rights movement, the anti-war movement and the free speech movement). "The contradiction between the goals of [those] movements, which centered on freedom and equality, and the unequal and exploited position of women within those movements generated collective outrage [among women in those movements]" (Mandle 1981:169; also see Evans 1980; Freeman 1975; Jagger 1983).

The anti-rape movement and battered women's movement grew out of the women's liberation movement. Schechter (1982:29) wrote:

In the early 1970s, it sometimes seemed as if the issue of battered women came out of nowhere. Suddenly feminist lawyers, therapists, and women's crisis and anti-rape workers were reporting hundreds of calls and visits from abused women desperately in need of housing and legal assistance. No mere accident, this ground swell was the result of the changing political consciousness and organizing activity of women.

¹ Feminist organizations are organizations which espouse a philosophy that recognizes women's subordination in society and whose goals seek to change women's position in society.

² The "New Left" refers to the resurgence of Marxist thought during the 1960s.

At the same time, the anti-rape movement across the United States was focusing attention on "the sexual abuse and exploitation of women" (Largen 1981:46).

The organizations that emerged to deal with rape and battering were mainly nonhierarchical. Because of dissatisfaction with their experiences in male-dominated social movement organizations of the 1960s, members of the women's liberation movement developed a strong suspicion of hierarchy and bureaucratic leadership. As a result, egalitarian and participatory organizational models were embraced.

Because they organized many of the first grassroots³ organizations, radical feminists⁴ shaped the anti-rape and battered women's movements.

[They] articulated a theory in which specific nonhierarchical organizational forms and self-help methods were a logical outcome of an analysis of violence against women [They] believed that . . . the division of labor and power between men and women became the basis for other forms of exploitation Patriarchy [was] seen not

³ Grassroots refers to political activities which occur at the local level, rather than those initiated on a state or national level and then brought into local communities.

⁴ Many theorists have divided feminism into three types: ". . . radical feminism which holds that gender oppression is the oldest and most profound form of exploitation, . . . [predating] all other forms including race and class; socialist feminism which argues that class, race, and gender oppression interact in a complex way . . .;" and liberal or bourgeois feminism which argues ". . . that women's liberation can be fully achieved without any major alterations to economic and political structures of contemporary capitalist democracies" (Eisenstein 1983:xix).

only as a system that oppressed women, but also one that structurally and conceptually creates, sustains, and justifies hierarchies, competition, [and] the unequal distribution of power and resources . . . (Schechter 1982:45).

While this radical feminist perspective influenced the development of many feminist organizations across the United States, numerous others were also founded by women and organizations not guided by this particular feminist analysis. Indeed, there was no overall philosophical position which women brought to the rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters springing up across the United States in the early 1970s. Although ostensibly connected through fragile networks and coalitions, each organization developed its own structure, philosophy, and strategy to address dilemmas such as those posed by scarce resources and the need to rely on the federal, state, or local governments for financial support.

By the mid-1970s, hundreds of programs for raped and/or battered women existed across the United States. As women became increasingly aware of available programs, it became more difficult to provide services for all those who needed them. According to a 1979 survey, 70 percent of the battered women requesting shelter in the state of Minnesota had to be turned away because of lack of space (Schechter 1982:81-86).

The high demand for services meant there was an endless search for money. After months or years of subsisting on

minimal funds, many feminist organizations decided that government funding was essential. Small, irregular donations and grants could not sustain the expansion which these organizations deemed necessary. However, their acceptance of government funds was a mixed blessing. When rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters received more financial and social support, their radical feminist principles were often undermined. Support for egalitarian organizational structures and society-wide social change was pushed aside by these organizations' need to expand and to comply with the guidelines of funding agencies in order to do so (Largen 1981:51-52).

Many accounts of early grassroots, feminist organizations identified their nonhierarchical authority structure as one of the most important differences between feminist and traditional organizations (Ahrens 1980; Grossholtz 1983; Largen 1981; McShane & Oliver 1978; Pittman, Burt & Gornick 1984; Schechter 1982). However, as feminist organizations increased in size, structural changes often occurred. Collective decision-making⁵ procedures often became unwieldy. Many feminists recognized the drawbacks of collective decision-making, especially in organizations which were totally "unstructured," that is, ". . . not structured in a particular manner" (Freeman

⁵ Collective decision-making procedures are procedures in which every organizational member is equally involved in making necessary decisions.

1973:77). Furthermore, community/government agencies that financed expansion often required feminist organizations to have a traditional, hierarchical authority structure. Over time, many rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters moved away from the use of collective decision-making procedures and towards a more hierarchical model.

In addition to a move toward hierarchical structures, rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters faced mixed community reactions and pressures. The media, government and community agencies, and funding sources often were not supportive of feminist organizations (Largen 1981; Schechter 1982). Feminist organizations were forced to accommodate to gain the financial support of these traditional community organizations.

Cooptation also represented a major dilemma for feminist organizations (Andler & Sullivan 1980; Fine 1985; Largen 1981; Schechter 1982; Sullivan 1982; Tierney 1982). Despite fears of cooptation, many feminist organizations agreed to the required organizational changes. Others resisted them. Many feminists believed that the political goals and vision of the women's liberation movement would be ". . . lost in the struggle to start, fund, manage, legitimate, and maintain programs for [raped and] battered women" (Schechter 1982:243). Within many organizations the staff and volunteers faced a contradiction between their feminist ideology and the need for funds to serve raped

and/or battered women. This lead to conflicts between members who had differing opinions about whether the organizations could accept financial support without compromising their feminist principles.

Even when feminist organizations received support from government and community funding agencies, money was still a never ending worry. These financial worries often contributed to staff "burnout," leading to another problem for rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters. While "burnout" was considered by feminists to be an unavoidable experience for social service workers, feminists believed they could escape it through political analysis and nonhierarchical decision-making procedures (Hart 1981; Schechter 1982; Sullivan 1982).

ALTERNATIVE ORGANIZATIONS⁶

Feminist organizations share many features with other alternative organizations. Alternative or collectivist-democratic organizations do not fit in Weber's "typology of authority relations," since they are based on a fourth type of legitimate authority, "value-rationality," on which Weber did not elaborate. Such organizations ". . . are committed

⁶ Alternative organizations are organizations which use non-hierarchical decision-making procedures, provide services or goods which are not readily available elsewhere and/or espouse an organizational philosophy which differs from organizations providing similar services and often differs from the rest of society.

first and foremost to substantive goals, to an ethic, even where this overrides commitment to a particular organizational setting" (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:22). In The Cooperative Workplace, Rothschild-Whitt (1986) proposed a "systematic, definitive model" of collectivist-democratic organizations. She created an ideal type which represented the end point on a continuum, contending that there are "degrees of collectivism." Collectivist-democratic organizations are not new; in the United States, they date back to the 1700s. Since the revolutionary period, collectivist-democratic organizations have appeared in distinct waves which precede times of major social movements. The most recent wave of collectivist organizations appeared in the 1970s.

Authority is the primary characteristic which distinguishes a collectivist-democratic organization from a hierarchical-bureaucracy. In a collectivist-democratic organization, all members participate fully and equally in decision-making procedures. Instead of rules of order and protocol, ". . . there is a 'consensus process' in which all members participate in the collective formulation of problems and negotiation of decisions. Only decisions that appear to carry the consensus of the group behind them carry the weight of moral authority" (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:51). Authority structure is an important variable when examining organizational conflict since nonhierarchical organizations

may move towards hierarchy in an attempt to control internal conflicts.

Collectivist-democratic organizations use as few rules as possible. Unlike hierarchical-bureaucratic organizations which depend on direct supervision and standardized rules and procedures to maintain social control, collectivist-democratic organizations rely on personal and moral appeals and on support of a common purpose. Social relationships in collectivist organizations are "holistic, affective and value-laden," in part, because they recruit members based on friendship and socio-political values. In contrast, bureaucracies recruit employees based on "specialized training and certification." Collectivist-democratic organizations rely on a shared sense of "purpose" and on personal relationships to provide incentives for participation; bureaucratic-hierarchies depend primarily on "remunerative incentives." In collectivist-democratic organizations, egalitarianism is emphasized and job differentiation is minimized; bureaucratic organizations are organized hierarchically and have "a complex network of specialized, segmental roles" (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:50-64).

Other studies of collectivist-democratic organizations have identified dimensions of organizational structure similar to those in Rothschild-Whitt's organizational model (Freeman 1973, 1982; Jamison 1985; Mansbridge 1980; Lindenfeld & Rothschild-Whitt 1982). According to McShane

and Oliver (1978), alternative, feminist social service agencies differed from "conventional agencies" in both authority structure and the type of social relationships found within the organization. In his studies of alternative organizations, Leonard Davidson (1982:161) consistently found that ". . . goals included social change, member actualization, and a sense of community; the structure was one that attempted to be nonbureaucratic. This set of goals and philosophy stands in contrast to . . . [those] of traditional work organizations."

Factors Constraining Organizational Success

Other studies have examined internal and external factors which constrain the achievement of organizational democracy and lead to tensions and conflicts among members of alternative organizations. The internal constraints are:

a) Time. Egalitarian, participatory decision-making procedures take a lot of time (Mansbridge 1973; Newman 1980; Rothschild-Whitt 1986).

b) Emotional intensity. Face-to-face relationships are more satisfying, but also more "emotionally threatening." Groups using collective decision-making procedures often "crack" under the stress of emotional confrontations. Little or no work gets done as members' energy is almost wholly used to deal with decision-making (Mansbridge 1973; Newman 1980).

c) Nondemocratic habits and values. Most people do not understand the attitudes and behaviors necessary for participation in a collectivist-democratic organization (Bernstein 1976; Rothschild-Whitt 1986). Gamson and Levin (1984:223-38) stressed "the need for a common set of norms, values and expectations" in order for alternative organizations to function and survive, but, since people have no experiences with these types of organizations, ". . . when new democratic organizations are formed, the dominant [belief system] is typically replaced by a set of romantic notions based on rejection of conventional norms rather than a shared vision of appropriate behavior."

d) Individual differences. All organizations contain people with different skills, knowledge, and personality characteristics which may cause internal problems for an organization which supports egalitarianism (Mansbridge 1973; Rothschild-Whitt 1986).

Alternative organizations also face external or environmental constraints which may be more damaging than the preceding internal constraints. Economic marginality is one major reason collectivist-democratic organizations fail. Those organizations that survive usually rely on financial support from the government and may be forced to change their organizational structure and goals in order to receive funding (Gamson & Levin 1984; Newman 1980). Social movement or alternative organizations often face a basic dilemma: "To

change society requires expansion and . . . stabilization of organizational activities, but such expansion might change the nonbureaucratic character of the . . . organization" (Davidson 1982:171-2).

Factors Necessary for Organizational Success

In addition to constraints on organizational success, there are factors which facilitate success. A number of internal conditions determine organizational chances for survival or success (Rothschild-Whitt 1986). These include:

a) Provisional orientation. Members of collectivist organizations often reject organizational permanence and assume that the organization will disband when it has achieved its goals.

b) Mutual and self-criticism. In collectives, many leaders resist the establishment of regular and public forums for criticism. Organizations which lack procedures for self-evaluation often experience ". . . explosive and sometimes destructive bouts of criticism unbound by any rules of fair play" (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:84-85). The existence of approved and regular procedures for mutual and self-criticism reduces inequalities and abuses of power. In her study of rape crisis centers, Simon (1981) argued that self-criticism of individual and group attitudes and behavior will undermine "oligarchical inclinations." She found that organizations with feminist ideologies frequently re-examined their organizational structure, leadership, and

"quality of life" in light of their original values and goals.

c) Limits to size and growth. The larger the organization, the more difficult it is to maintain internal democracy. Expansion often pushes collectivist-democratic organizations toward institutionalization, as the need for hierarchy and specialization increases (Davidson 1982:171-4; Lindenfeld & Rothschild-Whitt 1982:11-3). Conversely, rapid growth without institutionalization can produce increased internal conflicts.

d) Homogeneity. Homogeneity among members of collectivist-democratic organizations is a crucial condition for effective collective decision-making procedures. "Participants must bring to the process similar life experiences, outlooks and values if they are to arrive at agreement" (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:97). The absence of these similarities makes reaching consensus much more difficult.

e) Dependence on internal support base. People who have regular contact with an organization, that is, its members, customers, and clients, are its "internal support base." The more an organization depends on these people for social and financial support, rather than on external supports, the more likely that the organization will remain a collectivist-democratic organization. When organizations begin to rely on outside social and financial supports, they

are likely to lose interest in the concerns of their members.

f) Technology and the distribution of knowledge. The egalitarian nature of collectivist-democratic organizations is undermined by the need for employees of varying skill and knowledge. Disparities in skill and knowledge are structural features of an organization which often create conflictual situations (Davidson 1982; Gamson & Levin 1984; Mansbridge 1973; Rothschild-Whitt 1986).

In addition to these internal factors, certain external conditions encourage the survival of collectivist organizations (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:116-41). These include:

a) Oppositional services and values. Alternative organizations are usually founded because of a particular social need or service which is not being met by other community organizations. Therefore, they exist in opposition to competing "mainstream" organizations.⁷ Members' feelings of being "oppositional" vis-a-vis "mainstream" organizations solidify group identities and may justify the organization's existence.

b) A supportive professional base. Professionals in the community who support the organization provide both credibility and contacts for the organization.

⁷ Mainstream organizations are organizations with hierarchical decision-making procedures that provide widely accepted services.

c) Social movement orientation. Being connected to a social movement⁸ provides an organization with goals of social and personal change. Thus, the organization's goals are less likely to be coopted when it comes in contact with other community organizations and funding sources.

RESOURCE MOBILIZATION PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Rothschild-Whitt and other theorists have argued that the survival of alternative organizations and their ability to control internal conflicts is related to the solidarity of their relationship with the social environment. This emphasis on external conditions and community support is influenced by a new sociological perspective on social movements, resource mobilization. Classic social movement theories present an individualistic, social-psychological explanation for the development of social movements, while resource mobilization argues that their development can be understood by analyzing political and structural variables. Resource mobilization is relevant to this study because feminist organizations are likely to be at odds with their social communities.

⁸ A social movement is "a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represent preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution in society" (McCarthy & Zald 1977:1217-18). A social movement organization (SMO) is "any discrete organization which identifies itself with the preferences of a social movement and attempts to implement its goals" (Ibid).

According to McCarthy and Zald (1977:1216), five assumptions are central to the resource mobilization perspective of social movements: a) the understanding of social movements depends on the study of "the aggregation of resources (money and labor);" b) actual organizations within social movements need to be studied because they are necessary for the accumulation of resources; c) the involvement of individuals and organizations from outside social movements is important; d) a "supply and demand" model can be used to conceptualize the flow of resources to and from social movements; e) the concept of "costs and rewards" is necessary to understanding individual and organizational involvement in social movements. The organizations' relationships to their so-called social environment, that is, the individuals and organizations comprising the outside community, determine their successes and failures because these relationships provide crucial social and financial resources.

The concept of "linkage" was developed by Aveni (1978) who distinguished two independent dimensions of social movement organizations' linkage to their community: breadth and strength.

Strength refers to the degree of involvement a member of an outside organization has within a SMO [social movement organization] Stronger linkages . . . indicate a greater likelihood of both resource exchange across organizational boundaries and mutual influence between the SMO [social movement organization] and the outside organization. Breadth refers to the number of 'inroads' SMOs [social movement organizations] make

into different organizations or organizational sectors Linkages which are both broad and strong tend to bring high amounts of resources to an SMO [social movement organization]. [However], the strength and breadth of linkages vary independently of the productivity of those linkages; strong ties with organizations or sectors which have few resources will not generate significant amounts of support . . . (Tierney 1979:181-85).

Tierney (1979:220) concluded ". . . that the greater the integration of an organization with its environment, and the greater the degree of dependency on the environment, the greater the influence of the environment over the organization." Because of their compatibility with the social environment, some organizations have a greater chance of receiving extensive community support than others and, consequently, becoming more enmeshed with the social environment.

Resource mobilization has been used to study the feminist movement (Ferraro 1981; Freeman 1975; Simon 1981; Staggenborg 1988, 1989; Tierney 1982). This perspective is appropriate because:

a) Contrary to classic social movement perspectives, there is little overlap between grassroots women's liberation movement activists and their beneficiaries. Classic social movement theories argue that individual psychological stress produces social movements. However, participants in the anti-rape and battered women's movements are not exclusively abused women, but also include other

feminist activists and/or members of community service organizations.

b) Prior to the anti-rape and battered women's movements, there had been little "collective unrest" around rape and battering as predicted by classic theories. Public attention developed after these movements.

c) There is considerable volunteer involvement in these movements. McCarthy and Zald (1977) identified this as a common characteristic of most social movements of the 1960s and 1970s.

d) The acquisition of resources, a prime focus of this perspective, has been essential to many organizations in the anti-rape and battered women's movements.

The Impact of Institutionalization

Institutionalization is both a response to organizational efforts to acquire "outside" financial support and a way to minimize conflict. Institutionalization also occurs for other reasons: to stabilize or maintain an organization, to increase members' involvement in organizational tasks, and/or to increase the organization's ability to mobilize community resources. Both advantages and disadvantages of institutionalization exist. There are also positive and negative reactions to institutionalization among both organizational members and theorists.

By institutionalization, theorists mean:

a) formalization or bureaucratization and b) centralization or oligarchization. Formalization is the "elaboration and enforcement of rules" and centralization is the development of a structure in which decision-making is limited to top members of a hierarchy (Brager 1978:69-70). Formalization and centralization often may not occur together.

Among resource mobilization theorists, there has been a major debate between the supporters of a bureaucratic, centralized organizational model of social movements (Gamson 1975; McCarthy & Zald 1973, 1977) and the supporters of an informal, decentralized organizational model (Gerlach & Hine 1970). Gamson and McCarthy and Zald argued that a formalized, centralized model is effective because: a) it can increase participation because of the clearly defined membership roles and b) it can reduce conflicts because of the centralized decision-making procedures. Gerlach and Hine argued that an informal, decentralized social movement is more effective because a) it can maximize membership participation by promoting cohesiveness and individual support for the organization and b) it is highly adaptive (see Jenkins 1983:539).

Regardless of its advantages and disadvantages, institutionalization is not always attractive to an organization's members. In many alternative or social movement organizations, involvement in the organization and

in the provision of services or commodities is an end in itself for members (Rothschild-Whitt 1986). These organizations tend to have informal and decentralized organizational structures.

In addition to maintaining or stabilizing the organization, increasing its ability to deal with internal conflicts, and getting members more involved in organizational activities (Gamson 1975), institutionalization increases an organization's ability to mobilize resources. In social movement organizations dedicated to social change, both social and financial resources are essential to the attainment of their goals. In her study of the pro-choice movement, Staggenborg (1988:603-4) determined that formalized social movement organizations may be able to maintain themselves during unfavorable situations and that institutionalization may result in their goals becoming incorporated into mainstream politics. Simon (1981:13-17) also concluded that institutionalization does not always result in cooptation as many anti-rape movement participants believed, especially when financial support from multiple sources was sought.

In another study of feminist organizations, Staggenborg (1989) compared the formalized, centralized structure of the Chicago NOW (National Organization of Women) chapter with the informal, decentralized structure of the Chicago Women's Liberation Union (CWLU). She concluded that the formalized,

centralized structure of the NOW chapter ". . . facilitated organizational maintenance, but led to a narrowing of strategies and tactics . . . ;" while the informal, decentralized structure of the CWLU promoted "strategic and tactic innovation," but undermined "organizational maintenance," and probably accounted for its demise.

The disadvantages of the formalized, centralized structure of the Chicago NOW were its exclusiveness, since fewer people were involved in the decision-making procedures, and its decreased capacity for innovation. The lack of formal structures at the Chicago Women's Liberation Union was associated with financial instability and with difficulties integrating new members. Internal conflicts also appeared to be a product of decentralization and lack of formalized membership requirements; both ". . . allowed individuals, including those . . . not committed to its [CWLU] goals, to exert disproportionate influence over the organization" (Staggenborg 1989:89). Decentralization and lack of formal membership requirements also made it difficult for the CWLU ". . . to implement strategies aimed at external targets" (Ibid). On the other hand, a decentralized structure allowed the CWLU to attract large numbers of members involved in a wide variety of projects.

Staggenborg questioned whether formalization and centralization must always occur together. She argued that organizations which attempt to formalize their procedures

while retaining a decentralized structure often have difficulties gathering resources. Since outside resources, better mobilized by centralized structures, were often necessary for "organization maintenance," she concluded that most organizations became both formalized and centralized, even though there were significant advantages to formalized, decentralized organizations which could combine innovation and stability (Staggenborg 1989; also see Freeman 1973; Gerlach 1982).

Newman (1980) identified the beginnings of bureaucratization for many alternative organizations with the time when they began soliciting outside financial support. Institutionalization is "incipient" when having a paid staff, rather than volunteers, requires continual funding and when new volunteers are recruited to provide the services which are outlined in applications for funds. In order to receive continued funding, organizations have to document a persistent need for their services. Therefore, organizations begin to keep records of client services, referrals, staff evaluations, etc. Hence, the expectations of funding organizations force collectivist-democratic organizations to adopt record-keeping, bureaucratic structures. Differences between staff and volunteers also appear. For example, full-time staff members have more information about organizational activities than do part-time staff members or volunteers (Newman 1980:153-4).

Access to or control over information also leads to a concentration of power in organizations (Gouldner 1954). When volunteers have less information than staff members, it becomes difficult for them to share decision-making and a hierarchical decision-making structure emerges. Institutionalization is often inevitable in alternative or social movement organizations as they grow and seek financial support, regardless of whether the participants consciously chose to change the organizational structure (Newman 1980).

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Organizational culture may affect an organization's internal relations, its relationship with the social environment, and how it deals with internal conflicts. Jamison (1985) believed that the importance of organizational culture is often ignored by theorists looking at an organization's structural and environmental variables. Organizational culture is

. . . a common set of norms, values and expectations about organizational functions and operations that are accepted by all or most of the members of that organization. These may take the form of accepted traditions, laws, rules, procedures, or guidelines for the organization, which serve as the glue that integrates individual participants into the overall functioning of the organization. This . . . can be both implicit and explicit (Gamson & Levin 1984:223).

Differences in individual values and expectations may often be a source of conflict among staff, board, and

volunteers in organizations. The impact of differing beliefs is evident in Weston and Rofel's (1984) study of conflict in a lesbian auto-repair shop. In the beginning, the shop was small, there were few formalized rules or policies, and interactions and decisions were based on a "politics of trust." As the number of workers increased, the owners altered the organizational culture by changing their expectations of shop employees and moving towards a more formalized "politics of contract." Internal conflicts erupted when employees were unwilling to change their expectations to those of the owners.

Ideology is a major element of organizational culture because it links members' attitudes and actions (Pettigrew 1979:575). Ideology provides ". . . an overarching rationale or justification for the goals and activities of a SMO [social movement organization]" (Tierney 1979:39-40). Ideology also shapes organizational structures, often legitimating the strategies and tactics of social movement organizations and specifying acceptable personal behavior (Baker 1986; Freeman 1979).

The congruence of an organization's ideology with that of the dominant societal belief system is a crucial factor in an organization's fate. Ideology affects the success of feminist organizations because it selects among members and supporters, excluding those uncomfortable with feminism's

". . . militant or confrontative stance . . . towards men . . . or particular social institutions" (Tierney 1979:159).

Yet a deviant or variant organizational culture and ideology may not be a limiting factor, but a "symbolic reward system" and an organization's best defense against "symbolic cooptation" (Simon 1981). By developing "a community for itself, with the shared relationships, history, and meanings that a community entails," the organization strengthens the loyalty of its members and supporters and promotes cohesiveness (Simon 1981:18-9).

ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT

Overt conflict is endemic to democratic organizations since the expression of differing views and values is expected and encouraged. A high degree of membership involvement within or identification with an organization or community and an increased frequency of controversy or conflict was documented by Coleman (1957) in his study of community conflict resolution.

Gamson (1975:103) argued that organizations centralize power in order to reduce and control internal conflict. In her study of two feminist organizations, Staggenborg (1989) found that formalization also helped to reduce internal conflicts. In Chicago's NOW chapter, numerous conflicts over organizational tactics occurred in its early years. As formal procedures regulating membership and programs

developed and a more centralized authority structure was created, conflicts decreased.

In contrast, the Chicago Women's Liberation Union (CWLNU) did not institute formal membership criteria. Consequently, internal conflicts occurred when people who were not supportive of the organization's goals became involved. In both socialist and radical feminist organizations, lack of formal membership criteria frequently added another source of internal conflict to ever present ideological debates (Ferree & Hess 1985; Hansen 1986; Taylor 1983). Even organizations which were ideologically homogeneous continued to have heated debates over organizational goals and philosophy. "Factionalism," splits over organizational ideology, has often resulted in organizational demise. Decentralization in these organizations increased ". . . the likelihood of infiltration by persons with opposing ideological views" (Staggenborg 1989:84). During the 1970s this type of infiltration occurred more than once in the CWLNU. Finally, in 1976-77 the CWLNU steering committee initiated a "formal political split" which ultimately lead to the organization's demise.

The conflict proved fatal to the Union because, as one participant wrote, 'the work of the CWLNU ground to a halt as we became embroiled in this battle. More and more women in the CWLNU were becoming confused, frustrated, angry, and nonfunctional'. After the conflict was resolved, few of the work groups were functioning, and the core activists were exhausted Members of

the CWLU voted to disband the organization (Staggenborg 1989:85).

Therefore, Staggenborg concluded that internal organizational conflict is often a product of informality and decentralization. Thus, overt internal conflict is much more apt to be found in organizations which encourage members' participation in decision-making and organizational evaluation.

According to Rothschild-Whitt (1986), in addition to collective decision-making procedures, "de-differentiation of labor"⁹ is another key characteristic of collectivist-democratic organizations. The concern of both feminist and alternative organizations with the division of labor has intellectual and historical roots in the Marxist critique of capitalism.

. . . under capitalism workers were not able to control either the process or the product of their labor [Under these] conditions, work is inherently exploitative, coercive, and alienating for the worker In the never-ending search for profits, capitalists impose a rigid division of labor upon the workers (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:151).

While Rothschild-Whitt found that alienation is lower in collectivist-democratic organizations than in hierarchical-bureaucratic organizations, expectations are also much higher and overall satisfaction is mixed. Her study of collectivist-democratic organizations found that

⁹ De-differentiation of labor is the opposite of a detailed differentiation of labor.

most members were satisfied with ". . . the overall mission and service of the organization, the autonomy it offers, and the defining attributes of the collectivist form, such as equality and collective ownership . . . " (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:152). Few members were satisfied with the organization's efficiency, the job pressures, and the lack of money and job security. No one believed that the organization ran smoothly. Members' high expectations and sense of purpose produced greater satisfaction, but also resulted in higher stress. The three features which caused this satisfaction also generated stress and potential conflict: collective decision-making procedures, ". . . de-differentiation of labor, [and] . . . familial interpersonal relationships" (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:156).

SUMMARY

The preceding review of literature establishes a theoretical framework for this research by reviewing literature about feminist and alternative organizations, surveying the resource mobilization perspective on social movements and discussing literature on conflict. The literature on feminist organizations examines both the presence of nonhierarchical decision-making procedures in feminist organizations and the varying amounts of community support received by feminist organizations. The literature on alternative organizations focuses on Rothschild-Whitt's

(1986) ideal type, which identifies alternative organizations primarily by their nonhierarchical decision-making procedures. Literature on resource mobilization, used to develop the variable of community support, is also surveyed. Finally, literature about organizational conflict is discussed. My research, described in the next chapter, compares the decision-making procedures and the community support at feminist, alternative, and mainstream organizations and attempts to identify associations between these variables and organizational conflict.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This chapter addresses the methodology used in this research. The first section includes a description of the dependent variable (internal organizational conflict), the independent variables (authority structure and relationship to the social environment), and the mediating variable (organizational culture); a list of the hypotheses to be tested; and a discussion of the operationalization of the variables. The second section discusses the research design, including sampling and data gathering. The final section addresses problems encountered in the research.

DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is internal organizational conflict. Social theorists agree that overt conflict is endemic to organizations. For the purpose of this study, internal conflict is defined as the occurrence of overt tensions and/or disagreements among individuals and/or groups in an organization which are intensive and extended enough to have an impact on the organization. Intensity is

defined as the amount of impact that the conflict has on the individuals within an organization. It was measured as follows:

Intensity of Conflict

HIGH = multiple resignations¹ occurred, funding was lost, services were reduced or eliminated, job performances were lowered

MODERATE = a single resignation occurred, funding remained stable, services were reduced, job performances were lowered

LOW = no resignations occurred, funding remained stable, services were not reduced, job performances remained stable, but people were upset, angry and uncomfortable

Extent is defined as the proportion of individuals within and outside an organization who were affected. It was measured as follows:

Extent of Conflict

HIGH = all the individuals within the organization and some outside the organization were affected

MODERATE = more than 50%, but not all of the individuals within the organization were affected

¹ The data about staff resignations are from interviewees, not from organizational records.

LOW = less than 50% of the individuals within the organization were affected

The incidents of conflict are divided into five types:

a) staff vs. staff: these included conflicts between individual staff members and/or groups of staff members; in some cases, the director was aligned with a portion of the staff;

b) staff vs. board: these included conflicts between either a portion of the staff and board or the entire staff and board; the director, if involved, was aligned with the staff;

c) director vs. staff: these conflicts were between most or all of the staff and the director; in some cases, the board was involved, either aligned with one faction or split between them;

d) staff/board vs. staff/board: these conflicts involved two factions of the organization's members;

e) miscellaneous: these included conflicts between one individual and the director, the rest of staff and/or board; or conflicts between volunteers and the rest of the organization.

Independent Variables

The two independent variables in the study are an organization's authority structure and its relationship to the social environment. Authority structure is defined as the form of an organization's decision-making procedures.

Relationship to the social environment is defined as the character of the interaction between an organization and the community (ie. local, state and federal government agencies, other community organizations, funding sources, individual community members, the media).

Authority Structure. Drawing from Rothschild-Whitt's (1986) classification, authority structure is categorized by dividing organizations into three types: collectivist-democracy, modified-hierarchy, and hierarchical-bureaucracy. In a collectivist-democratic organization, authority resides in the organization and its individual members. Decisions are made using consensus among the members and there are minimal specified rules. In a hierarchical-bureaucratic organization, authority resides with individuals who hold particular positions or expertise. Compliance is to universal, fixed rules. In a modified-hierarchical² organization, various elements of collectives and hierarchies are combined in the authority structure. The ideal-typical modified-hierarchy includes one or more of the following characteristics: a) a history of collective decision-making; b) collective decision-making procedures used for some, but not all, current situations (ie. only in the shelter, only at particular staff/board meetings); c) collective decision-making procedures used at the director/

² The term "modified-hierarchy" was borrowed from Susan Schechter (1982).

administrator's discretion; or d) by-laws designating nonhierarchical decision-making procedures. A modified-hierarchy is a typical authority structure in feminist organizations:

On paper, the organization may resemble a traditional hierarchy. Information, however, is openly shared and staff and resident alike have input into decision-making. Consensus [collective] decision-making processes are still the ideal, although not always the reality. Within these modified hierarchies, cooperation and shared decision-making keep alive the feminist vision (Schechter 1982:100).

All the organizations in the study are either modified-hierarchies or hierarchical-bureaucracies. None are collectivist-democratic organizations. Many organizations which began as collectivist-democracies in the late 1960s and early 1970s have moved towards hierarchy for a number of reasons. External pressures were one reason. Another important reason was the realization that collective decision-making procedures had many limitations. Jo Freeman (1973:76-77) argued that in order for the women's liberation movement to grow beyond its initial stages of development it had to eliminate some of its "prejudices about organization and structure" since there was nothing intrinsically wrong with them, only in how they were used. She wrote:

For everyone to have an opportunity to be involved in a given group and to participate in its activities, the structure must be explicit, not implicit. The rules of decision-making must be open and available to everyone, and this can happen only if they are formalized.

Relationship to Social Environment. Three types of organizational relationship to the social environment are identified: peripheral, semi-integrated, and integrated. Like authority structure, this variable can also be placed on a continuum ranging from peripheral to integrated. The relationship to the social environment is constructed along three dimensions: community support, goals and philosophy, and economic condition.

Resource mobilization theorists identify an organization's accumulation of resources and the involvement of outside individuals and organizations as two crucial elements in the success of social movement organizations (McCarthy & Zald 1973). Increased community support, including government support, facilitates the achievement of organizational goals (Jenkins & Perrow 1977). Conversely, weak links to the social environment make it difficult for organizations to meet their goals. Failure to meet organizational goals is often associated with a high incidence of unresolved internal conflict (see Staggenborg 1989).

Having controversial goals and philosophy (with regard to social norms) is also a source of internal conflict. The primary measure of socially controversial goals and philosophy is an organization's support for social change. Many of the feminist organizations studied defined their purpose(s) as twofold: the provision of services for women

and support for social changes to improve or change women's position in society. Peripheral organizations often support activities promoting social change as a part of their organizational purpose. The attitude of funders towards social change philosophies was mentioned by Schechter (1982:95):

In many cases, the funding agencies downplayed or discouraged social change. Federal Title XX funds can be used for services only, not for community education. Helping victims was tolerable while changing social conditions that created victims was far less desirable, measurable, or fundable.

Mediating Variable

This study also examines the mediating variable, organizational culture. Organizational culture is important to this study because feminist and alternative organizations differ from mainstream organizations along this dimension. While the central hypotheses propose that structural variables account for internal conflict, an organization's culture also influences the incidence of conflict. Some characteristics of organizational culture make it easier for organizations to manage conflict. Others make it more difficult.

Organizational culture is defined as certain expectations among the members of an organization. These expectations include beliefs: a) that collective decision-making procedures will be used; b) that relations among the

staff & volunteers will be cohesive and supportive; c) that everyone will share the same "political" ideology.

HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis I: Organizations with modified-hierarchical authority structures are more likely to experience internal conflicts than organizations with hierarchical authority structures.

Hypothesis II: Organizations with peripheral relationships to the social environment are more likely to experience internal conflicts than organizations with semi-integrated or integrated relationships to the social environment.

Hypothesis III: Modified-hierarchical organizations with peripheral relationships to the social environment are more likely to experience internal conflicts than hierarchical organizations with semi-integrated or integrated relationships to the social environment.

Hypothesis IV: Organizations with an organizational culture which includes: a) expectations of collective decision-making, b) cohesive relationships among its members, c) an ideology of social change, and d) a board of directors who is involved in daily program operations are more likely to have internal conflicts than organizations with an organizational culture which did not include these four characteristics.

Hypothesis V: Organizations which have ideological homogeneity and/or written policies, procedures, and job descriptions are less likely to experience internal conflicts than organizations which have ideological heterogeneity and/or do not have written policies, procedures, and job descriptions.

OPERATIONALIZATION OF VARIABLES

Authority Structure

The key indicators of organizational authority structure are: a) the definitions in the by-laws of normative decision-making procedures; b) an organization's history of decision-making procedures; and c) interviewees' evaluations of conformity or deviation from the by-laws. The authority structure of the six organizations in the study was either modified-hierarchical or hierarchical.

Relationship to Social Environment

The three dimensions of an organization's relationship to the social environment are community support, goals and philosophy, and economic condition. An organization's relationship to the social environment is categorized as peripheral, semi-integrated, or integrated.

Community Support. Community support has two dimensions: organization connections to other community organizations and board connections to other community organizations.

a) Organization connections to other community organizations. These connections include inter-organizational relationships, staff training by other organizations, involvement in interagency committees and task forces, and cosponsorships of organizational activities. The more numerous and broad these connections are the broader is an organization's community support. In some cases, peripheral organizations chose to only have connections with like-minded organizations, thus limiting their social resources. Organizations which primarily have narrow links to similar organizations are typed as peripheral. Organizations which have primary connections to similar organizations, but secondary connections to dissimilar organizations, are defined as having average connections;³ these organizations are typed as semi-integrated. Those with connections to both similar and dissimilar organizations are defined as having broad connections and are typed as integrated.

b) Board connections to other community organizations. Many board members represent particular community constituencies or organizations. Board connections are evaluated as narrow, average, or broad using the same criteria as for organization connections to other community

³ Primary links refer to those connections which organizations accesses on a daily or weekly basis, while secondary links were those which are accessed less frequently, possibly monthly or quarterly.

organizations. Some boards of directors have more wide-ranging community connections than other boards. A board with members from diverse institutions (ie. law enforcement, legal services, other social services, the business world, etc.) is considered to have broad community support, while a board with limited community representation (e.g. only social service workers) is considered to have narrow community support. Some organizations may deliberately chose board members with limited connections because they are more likely to be aligned philosophically with the organization.

Goals and Philosophy. The goals and philosophy of an organization are indicated by a) references to social change in the by-laws or "mission" statement, b) members' expectations that an organization supports social change, and c) an organizational history of social change activities. Organizational goals and philosophy are categorized as either peripheral or integrated. Those organizations whose goals and philosophy are socially controversial are typed as peripheral. Organizations whose goals and philosophy conform to accepted community attitudes are considered integrated.

Economic Condition. An organization's economic condition has two dimensions: source of funding and financial stability.

a) Source of Funding. The percentage of funds an organization receives from government sources is a key indicator of this dimension. Organizations receiving less than one-third of their funds from government sources are usually typed as peripheral. Organizations receiving one-third to two-thirds of their funds from the government are considered semi-integrated and organizations receiving more than two-thirds of their funds from government sources are integrated. A high percentage of government funds is associated with correspondence between an organization's goals and philosophy and the philosophy of a majority of other community organizations. Organizations also receive funds from a variety of other sources. All the organizations in the study, except the largest one, received United Way funds. Two organizations also had other reliable, time-proven sources of funding which gave them a solid financial base. For example, the community radio station was financially dependent on biannual pledge drives and a Halloween party.

b) Financial stability. This dimension is measured by estimating the stability of services and staff: those with a reduction in organizational services and staff have low stability, those with maintenance of service and/or staff levels are moderate, and those with an increase in services and/or staff are high. All six administrators believed they were operating on limited budgets, but some organizations

suffered severe financial shortages which drastically changed the organizations.

Table I, Table II, and Table III show the dimensions of the relationship to the social environment for peripheral, semi-integrated, and integrated organizations.

Organizational Culture

There are six indicators of the mediating variable, organizational culture:

Expectations of Collective Decision-Making.

Expectations that collective decision-making procedures will be used came from staff and volunteers' previous experiences and/or knowledge of similar organizations or of this particular organization's history. These expectations are the greatest in feminist and alternative organizations. But, it is important to remember that reality did not always match these expectations of collective decision-making procedures.

Social Relations. Expectations of social support and cohesiveness among the staff and volunteers are another characteristic of organizational culture. The staff and volunteers at all the organizations socialized outside the workplace to some degree; however, these social networks often only involved some members of the organization.

Expectations of social cohesiveness can either be a blessing or a curse in the eyes of an organization's

TABLE I
DIMENSIONS OF A PERIPHERAL ORGANIZATION

Community Support		
a)	Organizational Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Narrow
b)	Board Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Narrow
Goals and Philosophy:		Peripheral
Economic Condition		
a)	Source of Funding:	Peripheral
b)	Financial Stability:	Low

TABLE II
DIMENSIONS OF A SEMI-INTEGRATED ORGANIZATION

Community Support		
a)	Organizational Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Average
b)	Board Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Average
Goals and Philosophy:		Semi-integrated
Economic Condition		
a)	Source of Funding:	Semi-integrated
b)	Financial Stability:	Moderate

TABLE III
DIMENSIONS OF AN INTEGRATED ORGANIZATION

Community Support

a) Organizational Connections to
Other Community Organizations:	Broad
b) Board Connections to Other
Community Organizations:	Broad

Goals and Philosophy:	Integrated
-----------------------	------------

Economic Condition

a) Source of Funding:	Integrated
b) Financial Stability:	High
-

members. One Feminist II staff member, believing that staff cohesiveness was a strength of this battered women's shelter, said, "This kind of agency is so unique because it's small, it's isolated, and you have to get along with everybody" In contrast, others believed that cohesiveness often produced unclear boundaries which had a dubious impact on the organization:

You tend to know everyone so well and you . . . know a lot . . . about your coworkers . . . , sometimes more than I ever wanted to know [about them] I've gotten somewhat enmeshed at times with what goes on with people outside of work, as well as what goes on at work. At times that's OK, but sometimes it hasn't been [OK].

Another aspect of social relations is the amount to which staff and volunteers are identified with the organization. Berger and Zald (1978:831) discussed Hirschman's "two modes of expressing discontent": exit or voice. They argued that, rather than leaving an organization when they are unhappy, staff and volunteers may chose to stay and voice their dissatisfaction. They hypothesized that ". . . the more difficult or costly it is to exit and the greater the commitment to the incentives of the organization" (1978:844), the more likely individuals will be to stay and attempt to change the organization. Therefore, a high incidence of conflict may be a by-product of emotional investment in an organization by staff, board members, and/or volunteers. These individuals may be so supportive of the continuation of an

organization's structure and goals and philosophy, as they have known or imagined them, that conflicts occur between them and other individuals and/or groups in the organization.

Ideology. Social change as an organizational goal is another distinguishing characteristic of organizational culture. Tierney emphasized the importance of ideology when analyzing an organization's goals and philosophy:

Ideology supports organizational goals and justifies the concrete actions engaged by members. It is distinguishable from the goals . . . in that the latter concerns future objectives, while the former places the goals in a larger philosophical context and elaborates on why the goals should be sought and how the organization should go about obtaining them (1979:160).

Ideology is measured by a) an organization's by-laws or "mission" statement which sometimes includes a declaration of social change goals and b) interviewees' beliefs that an organization supports social change.

Board Role in the Organization. In hierarchical-bureaucratic organizations, boards of directors are involved primarily with policy-making and fund-raising. At the three peripheral, modified-hierarchical organizations, board members were routinely involved in the organization's daily operations. These organizations were the smallest organizations in the study and had fewer layers of personnel between the board, the staff, and/or the volunteers. Therefore, there were more opportunities for the board and the staff, and/or volunteers to interact on a regular basis.

Often these interactions and the board involvement in daily operations was supported by an ideology of egalitarianism.

Ideological Range. Ideological range refers to the amount of unanimity among an organization's members about its goals and philosophy. An organization's ideological range is either a) homogeneous, that is, there is unanimity among organizational members about the organization's goals and philosophy, or b) heterogeneous, that is, there is disagreement among organizational members about its goals and philosophy. Many theorists postulate that ideological homogeneity is necessary if collectivist-democratic organizations are to be successful (Freeman 1973; Gamson & Levin 1984; Mansbridge 1982; Rothschild-Whitt 1986). The primary measure of ideological range is the interviewees' statements regarding unanimity about the organization's goals and philosophy.

Written Policies, Procedures, and Job Descriptions.

The primary measures of this dimension are the presence or the absence of written policies, procedures, and job descriptions which inform members of organizational expectations and history (see Gamson & Levin 1984).

Although collectivist-democratic organizations strive for a minimum of rules, members generally believe that some rules may be useful. "[Additionally], in a collective, rules are always subject to group negotiation and change Certain rules may actually enhance democratic control"

(Rothschild-Whitt 1986:53). Lack of organizational documents or the presence of outdated organizational documents increases the likelihood of conflicts and exacerbates them when they do occur. The importance of formalized organizational rules is confirmed by studies which found that the lack of "formalized membership requirements" often correlates with internal conflicts (Staggenborg 1989).

RESEARCH DESIGN

Sampling

This study examines internal conflict in organizations in relation to the organizational authority structure and the relationship to the social environment. Five urban organizations and one suburban organization were studied: three were feminist organizations, two were alternative organizations, and one was a mainstream social service organization. Feminist organizations are defined as organizations which espouse a philosophy that recognizes women's subordination in society and whose goals seek to change women's position in society. Alternative organizations are organizations which use nonhierarchical decision-making procedures, provide services or goods which are not readily available elsewhere, and/or espouse an organizational philosophy which differs from organizations providing similar services and seeks to change social

structures. Mainstream organizations are organizations which have hierarchical decision-making procedures, provide widely accepted social services, and do not have a social change philosophy. All the organizations were non-profits, provided information and/or services on a continuous basis, and relied on both paid staff and volunteers to provide these services. Initially, the sample included twelve organizations in an effort to locate organizations which met the criteria listed above and which had a variety of authority (decision-making) structures.

In none of the organizations chosen was hierarchy completely absent. Given the external and internal pressures which most organizations experience, it is not surprising that totally nonhierarchical or collectivist-democratic organizations were impossible to locate. In her study of 90 rape crisis centers, O'Sullivan (1978:50) suggested that collectives might be ". . . poorly suited to meet a high level of demand over a range of services." O'Sullivan's conclusion also applies to battered women's shelters and other types of alternative organizations. Rothschild-Whitt (1986:64) concluded that in practice collectives ". . . can be approximated, but not perfectly attained." Pressures and struggles faced by feminist organizations often lead to more hierarchical authority structures. The shift is often caused by overwork of staff and volunteers, lack of worker accountability, failure to

accomplish administrative tasks, excessive time spent on collective decision-making, and/or the expectations of funding sources (Schechter 1982:95; also see Freeman 1973).

In selecting the sample organizations, controls for the age and the size of the organizations were introduced in order to limit their influence on the incidence of internal conflict. Five of the organizations selected were founded in the late 1960s or early 1970s. The sixth organization was less than five years old, but was located at the same site as a similar thirty-year-old organization that had dissolved (the two organizations shared a number of board members and funding sources). Four organizations had approximately ten paid staff members. Two organizations were larger, with staffs of 25 to 50 individuals; at these organizations the study focused on a subsection of the organization. Volunteer groups at the six organizations varied from ten to three hundred people. The community radio station had the largest group of volunteers, who produced the bulk of its 24 hour programming. The six organizations included: three feminist organizations working with women who were battered or raped; two alternative organizations, a community radio station and a medical clinic for the indigent; and a mainstream social service agency for seniors. The medical clinic and the senior citizens program were components of larger social service agencies.

The study examined internal events between January 1988 and June 1989. Interviewees were asked to limit their responses to events which took place during that time period. Because the interviews were conducted after the research time frame, retrospective recall problems occurred. Also, the data often included information about the prior history of the organizations; this information is noted when relevant to the research.

A longitudinal study would have provided more accurate data about the relationship between conflict, authority structure, and relationship to the social environment, since neither of the independent variables remained static over time. However, the constraints of time and the difficulties locating individuals involved during the organization's entire history limited my ability to gather better data.

Data Gathering

Data about these organizations were collected from sixty-one interviews with administrators, board members, staff members, and volunteers. The initial contact with interviewees was made by telephone. All administrators agreed to be interviewed after the research project was explained.

The first interview at each organization was conducted with the administrator and identified basic organizational characteristics: age of organization, types of services provided, number of staff and volunteers, size of board,

amount of staff and board turnover, and source of funding [see Appendix A]. These initial interviews were conducted between December 1988 and February 1989.

The second phase of the research narrowed the original sample to six organizations. A few organizations were eliminated because they did not meet the sampling criteria (ie. they did not use volunteers or did not provide social services/information). Others were eliminated because the administrators refused to allow their staff, board members, and/or volunteers to be interviewed. Other organizations were eliminated because they were undergoing a change of administrators and there was no key person to contact.

The next phase of the research began with a second interview of the administrators at the six selected organizations. This interview identified the types of community support each organization received by examining board composition, the organizations' contacts with other organizations, its financial support, its local fund-raising activities, and the media attention it received [see Appendix A].

In the final phase of the research, staff, volunteers, and board members were contacted. Snowball sampling was used to find interviewees. At most organizations, the staff and board were interviewed first. Volunteers' names were then obtained from staff or other volunteers. I attempted to interview volunteers who were diverse with reference to

race, ethnicity, and gender. At one of the battered women's shelters, none of the board members were willing to be interviewed; at the other five organizations at least one board member was interviewed. I ceased interviewing at each organization when no new data about internal conflicts were obtained (see Gamson 1975; Glaser & Strauss 1967).

This last phase of interviews took place between November 1989 and February 1990. These interviews were conducted in various locations: the organization's offices, the interviewee's home, my home, or local restaurants. Each interviewee received a letter explaining the research, signed a consent form, and was assured of confidentiality and anonymity prior to the interview [see Appendix B].

The interview included open-ended questions about the interviewee's position at the organization, their involvement with similar organizations, their expectations before coming to the organization, their reactions to conflict in their lives, and information about any organizational conflicts they had witnessed or participated in between January 1988 and June 1989. The final section of the interview asked for specific details about each incident of conflict (i.e., who was involved, how long did it last, did it affect services, was funding affected, etc.) [see Appendix A]. The interviews varied in length from thirty minutes to two hours.

The number of interviews at each organization varied from six to nineteen, with an average of eight to ten interviews at each organization [see Appendix C]. The community radio station, with its large and diverse group of volunteers, was the site of the most interviews.

PROBLEMS WITH THE RESEARCH

Various problems occurred during this study: in data gathering, in overcoming cultural biases about "conflict," and in operationalizing some of the variables.

Data Gathering

All the potential interviewees did not agree to be interviewed and some who agreed were not straightforward. Some, particularly administrators, were difficult to contact, reticent to share information, and protective of their organizations. For example, the administrator at a women's health clinic which provided abortions did not respond to repeated phone calls. Once she finally agreed to be interviewed she was reluctant to discuss problems in the organization and was anxious that some individuals at the organization might disclose unflattering information. She wanted the right to provide feedback on each staff/volunteer interview; because of this request, I did not select this organization as part of the final sample. At two other organizations, administrators were unwilling to give me copies of organizational documents even though they were

public record. Another administrator, whose organization experienced major turmoil during her tenure, provided me with a list of past staff and volunteers I should not contact; these women had been threatened with a libel suit if they discussed the organization or this director with anyone.

Some interviewees said they felt as if they were betraying their organization's confidentiality when they discussed internal conflicts. Therefore, some data are very ambiguous. This hesitancy occurred with some of the staff at three organizations (one feminist, one alternative, and the mainstream organization), with the director at one of the feminist organizations, and with directors at organizations not included in the final sample. It was also difficult for interviewees to accurately remember details about events which occurred in the previous twelve to eighteen months. Frequently, it appeared that the data gathered were actually a "group account" developed since the event occurred. This was most obvious in organizations where outside consultants had come into the organization to facilitate the resolution of a particular conflict.

Biases re: Conflict

There were cultural biases in reporting conflicts among the predominantly white, middle class interviewees who

perceived "conflict" as negative.⁴ Prior to the interviews, the interviewees and I discussed the fact that conflict can be either positive or negative, constructive or destructive. Nevertheless, most of interviewees perceived the internal conflicts as having a negative rather than a positive impact on the organization.

In addition to cultural biases about conflict, the organizational culture influenced how the members of each organization perceived conflict. Organizational culture produced differences, not only in the incidence of conflict, but also in whether the conflicts were recognized or unrecognized. This presented an interesting problem because this research only identified overt conflicts. Two aspects of organizational culture permitted conflict to be overt: a) conflict was tolerated or sanctioned in an organization and b) individuals in an organization were allowed to talk about conflicts.

Difficulties Operationalizing Variables

I also had difficulties operationalizing the independent variable, relationship to the social environment. A number of potential measures of this organizational characteristic were discarded because they showed no variation (e.g. local fund-raising activities and

⁴ I am also greatly affected by this bias, having grown up in a family which believed that any type of conflict was negative.

media coverage of the organization's activities). The organization connections to other community organizations were also difficult to measure. Organization administrators were unable to take the time necessary to compile specific data about all the organization's community connections. Therefore, much of the data about organizational connections are impressionistic.

SUMMARY

This chapter first introduces the dependent variable, internal organizational conflict. Second, it presents the independent variables, authority structure and relationship to the social environment, and the mediating variable, organizational culture. Authority structure was developed using Rothschild-Whitt's (1986) ideal type of a collectivist-democratic organization. The resource mobilization perspective on social movements influenced the development of relationship to the social environment.

Additionally, the chapter lists the hypotheses to be tested; presents the operationalization of all the variables; describes the sampling and data gathering; and discusses research problems. The research problems included difficulties with data gathering, negative cultural biases about conflict, and difficulties operationalizing the variable relationship to the social environment.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF ORGANIZATIONS

This chapter describes the six organizations in the study, grouped according to organizational type: (i) feminist, (ii) alternative or (iii) mainstream. The organizations' authority structures and relationships to the social environment are described. The descriptions also include data about the incidence of internal conflicts, as well as about the organizations' services, size, and age.

The study was done in a predominantly white,¹ Northwest metropolitan area with a population of approximately 1.5 million. Five organizations operated in the area's central city with a population of approximately 430,000; one organization served an adjacent suburban community.

THE FEMINIST ORGANIZATIONS

Feminist Organization I

One of the first battered women's shelters in the United States, this organization was incorporated in July 1975. It provides an emergency shelter, a crisis line, and transitional housing for women and children who are

¹ According to 1990 census figures, the metropolitan area is 91 percent Caucasian.

survivors of domestic violence and conducts both children's programs and women's support groups. Feminist I also does community outreach and education about domestic violence, with a coordinator speaking to numerous organizations and educational institutions. Feminist I's 1988 budget was \$190,000.00 with approximately 33 percent government funds.

In early 1989, the organization had a staff of fourteen (seven full-time and seven part-time). A core of ten active volunteers assisted the paid staff in the shelter, answered the crisis line, and facilitated support groups. As of December 1988, 40 percent of staff had been employed at the organization for twelve months or less. In addition to staff turnover, Feminist I had difficulties keeping all the board of directors positions filled.

The executive director, an African-American woman, had worked at Feminist I for approximately three years, including fifteen months as the executive director. Prior to becoming the executive director, she had been a shelter staff member. She resigned during the study. During the study period, the organization advertised for both an executive director and a shelter coordinator. Turnover in the position of shelter coordinator was high; four women had held the position in the prior two years. None of the women

who had been shelter coordinator, either before or during the study,² were interviewed.

Feminist I had a history of collective decision-making, but during the study the use of collective decision-making procedures was left to the administrator's discretion. One white staff member who had worked at other battered women's programs recalled her first days at the organization:

Being at [Feminist I], I thought, was going to be this wonderful, truly radical experience. Of course, the thing I didn't know when I came in to volunteer was that they had already gone to hierarchy. That was a real distressing feeling for me. . . . The people there knew how to voice all the platitudes, but they didn't know how to live the reality I had in my little head.

No other staff or volunteers mentioned feeling this way when becoming members of Feminist I.

There was a great deal of conflict at Feminist I during 1988 and the first half of 1989. Pervasive tensions flared into periodic confrontations, many of which were associated with conflicts about race and/or sexual preference and with different opinions about "politically correct" activities. Many women of color, including the executive director, left the organization during this period. Some interviewees believed the board never gave this director the autonomy which prior directors had; but a native American staff

² When I was interviewing staff members at Feminist I, the shelter coordinator had been on the job less than a month.

member believed that the issue was the director's lack of skills:

. . . it is racist to put a woman of color into a supervisory position with no training and no experience. She is not [meeting people's expectations], not because she can't do it, she's probably very capable and could do it if she knew what she was suppose to do, if you gave her the information she needed [It's] racist when you put someone in a job and create a situation where they are going to fail.

Except for this above-mentioned conflict between the director and the board which was high in intensity, all the other conflicts at Feminist I were moderate or low in intensity and extent. These included personality clashes between staff members and disagreements about the political goals of the organization. [Table IV lists Feminist I's authority structure, relationship to the social enviornment, and incidents of conflict.]

Feminist Organization II

Also a battered women's shelter, Feminist II was located in a suburban community. It began providing services in 1986. Feminist II was in the same building as a battered women's shelter which had dissolved after losing its funding because of severe internal conflicts. After its dissolution, the county and United Way, two of its primary funders, hired consultants to establish a successor organization. These consultants recruited a board of directors, assisted them in hiring a director, and designed the organizational structure.

TABLE IV
FEMINIST ORGANIZATION I

Authority Structure:	Modified-Hierarchy
Relationship to Social Environment:	Peripheral
Community Support:	Peripheral
-Organizational Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Narrow
-Board Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Narrow
Goals and Philosophy:	Peripheral
Economic Condition:	Peripheral
-Source of Funding:	Peripheral
-Financial Stability:	Low
Incidents of Conflict: ³	Five

³ See Appendix D for a description of the specific incidents of conflict at each organization.

Feminist II provides services and housing similar to those of Feminist I: a shelter and a crisis line for women and children who were survivors of domestic violence, support groups for women, community outreach, and education. Feminist II's 1988 budget was \$180,000.00 with 39 percent government funds. In early 1989, Organization II had a staff of thirteen (seven full-time and six part-time). There were also eight to ten active volunteers who assisted the staff. During 1988, there was a 70 percent turnover in the staff.

About four months prior to being interviewed, the white female administrator had replaced the original executive director of the new organization. Two months later, this administrator resigned, citing "overwork." However, during the interview, she had discussed conflicts between herself and some of the staff:

There is a definite power struggle between myself and another staff member who was there prior to me [The conflict] focuses around one of the staff members that I hired as being unacceptable to the rest of the staff; [but] I see it as much more of a power and control issue.

However, some staff members said that they believed the director had used the "incompetent" staff member as a "scapegoat," possibly to direct attention away from her own incompetence.

There were also discrepancies in accounts of decision-making procedures at Feminist II. When asked how decisions were made, the director stated, "I go towards consensus

[collective decision-making] in that I take almost everything to the staff" In contrast, all of the staff said the director never asked for input from them.

Feminist II had fewer instances of conflict than Feminist I, but the conflict between the director and the rest of the staff and volunteers was high in both intensity and extent. All the conflict during the study was associated with this clash. One white staff member said:

Some of it may have been the fact [that] she was older and she [had] just finished her master's degree; people assumed because of her age that she had experience . . . and would know how to handle these things. In fact she was very unprepared and had gotten in way over her head She admitted that herself . . . ; the job was not what she had anticipated . . . and she didn't feel competent. . . .

[Table V lists Feminist II's authority structure, relationship to the social environment, and incidents of conflict.]

Feminist Organization III

Founded in 1972, this organization provides community outreach, education, information and referral for women who are survivors of either battering or rape. A 24-hour crisis line and support groups for these women are its major services. Feminist III's budget for 1988 was \$150,000.00 with 33 percent government funds.

Feminist III had six full-time staff members in early 1989. The organization also had approximately 25 volunteers who staffed the crisis line, did staff training, community

TABLE V
FEMINIST ORGANIZATION II

Authority Structure:	Hierarchy
Relationship to Social Environment:	Semi-integrated
Community Support:	Semi-integrated
-Organizational Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Average
-Board Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Broad
Goals and Philosophy:	Integrated
Economic Condition:	Semi-integrated
-Source of Funding:	Semi- integrated
-Financial Stability:	Moderate
Incidents of Conflict:	Two

outreach, and facilitated support groups. In the eighteen months from January 1988 to June 1989, there was a 100 percent staff turnover. There was also over 50 percent turnover of board members and the organization had difficulties filling these board vacancies. The director, a white woman with a background in public school administration and no work experience in rape crisis centers or battered women's shelters, had been hired in early 1988.

During the time frame of the study, the mode of decision-making at Feminist III was left to the executive director's discretion. The director stated that she used collective decision-making only when it was convenient because it took so much time to get anything done and because ". . . it's really easy to get lost in the consensus [collective] decision-making process." There was a strong commitment to social change goals and philosophy among individuals at the organization. The by-laws stated that the ". . . intent of [Feminist III was] not only to provide social services to women, but also to enact social change through the empowerment of women."

Feminist III experienced the most severe conflicts in the study. The majority of these conflicts focused around confrontations between the executive director, the rest of the staff, and part of the board. The issues included the director's supposed incompetence and an "inappropriate"

sexual relationship she was having with another individual in the organization. Many interviewees believed the conflicts were caused by homophobia.⁴ There was an extremely high amount of conflict during 1988, the director's first year at Feminist III. There was also high staff and board turnover during this year. This organization was also the only one which lost a portion of its funding as a result of organizational turmoil during the time frame of the study. When United Way cut the organization's funds because of internal problems, Feminist III was forced to terminate a staff member because of financial shortages.⁵ [Table VI lists Feminist III's authority structure, relationship to the social environment, and incidents of conflict.]

THE ALTERNATIVE ORGANIZATIONS

Alternative Organization I

A "non-commercial, listener supported" community radio station, Alternative I has operated since 1968. It provides 24-hour programming, including diverse music, news, and public affairs programs for the progressive community.

⁴ The executive director at Feminist III was the director who gave me a list of people I could not interview because they were being threatened with a libel suit. Therefore, I did not interview anyone who might have offered a different perspective on these conflicts.

⁵ Feminist I and III were the only organizations which laid off staff because of financial shortages during the tenure of the study.

TABLE VI
FEMINIST ORGANIZATION III

Authority Structure:	Modified-Hierarchy
Relationship to Social Environment:	Peripheral
Community Support:	Peripheral
-Organizational Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Narrow
-Board Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Narrow
Goals and Philosophy:	Peripheral
Economic Condition:	Peripheral
-Source of Funding:	Peripheral
-Financial Stability:	Low
Incidents of Conflict:	Four

Alternative I's 1988 budget was \$270,000.00 with less than 33 percent government funds.

In early 1989, Alternative I had seven staff members (six full-time and one part-time). It also had 200 to 300 volunteers who did the majority of the programming and performed tasks ranging from clerical work to fund-raising. The staff responsibilities were primarily administrative. A white staff member said at times she felt like a "slave" since much of her time was spent doing the "grit work" [sic] for the many volunteer programmers. In 1988, there was a 57 percent turnover in staff. There was also a six month period immediately prior to the study when the station had no station manager, its primary administrator.

Alternative I was the least hierarchical organization in the study. This may have been because of its extreme reliance on its volunteers who were active in all areas of the organization. Its nine-member board of directors was elected by the organization's 3000 local subscribers from nominees of the board, staff, volunteers, and subscribers.⁶ Many volunteers served on the board and/or board committees; so volunteers had a great deal of power in many areas of the organization. Alternative I's by-laws gave the board of directors unusual powers, specifically in the areas of staff hiring and programming changes. At the other organizations

⁶ The board members at all the other organizations in the study were recruited by the staff and board; then nominated and elected by the board.

in the study, hiring and programming decisions were normally made by the administrator and/or staff members.

Alternative I's goals and philosophy supported social change and progressive positions on a wide range of social issues which did not get attention in other area media. Thus, the organization's mission statement pledged the station to ". . . filling needs that other media [did] not, placing a priority on providing a forum for unpopular or obscure subjects . . . , and seeking out controversial or neglected perspectives on important issues."

According to the white male station manager, 45 percent of Alternative I's funds came from the membership through pledge drives and other fund-raising activities.

Rothschild-Whitt (1986:100-3) found that ". . . the most participatory organizations [were] those that rely on internal funding from their clients and customers."

Alternative I's dependence on membership backing supported her premise that one condition for the survival of a collectivist-democratic organization was a dependence on its "internal support base."

Alternative I experienced the most incidents of conflict; none of the conflicts were high in either intensity or extent. The conflicts ranged from severe personal clashes to disagreements over organizational policies. Many conflicts were between various factions within the organization: often minority groups, but also

factions with differing opinions on issues such as gender parity on the air, affirmative action, underwriting, and program changes. There is a possible relationship between the greater amount of interaction that occurred at Alternative I, the most nonhierarchical and largest (membership-wise) organization in the study, and its high incidence of conflict. More individuals involved in more decisions lead to more potential situations where conflict might occur.

Historically, racial tensions and program changes have generated the most conflict at Alternative I. For example, four to five years prior to this study, there was a major confrontation between the African-American community (both volunteers and listeners) and the board of directors. It occurred when a program director proposed changes in the African-American program schedule. In protest against these proposed changes, a large group of African-Americans picketed the station and attended a board meeting. In reaction to demands from the African-American community, the board guaranteed that African-American programming would never be cut.

Additionally, procedures for making program changes were cumbersome and unwieldy. Proposed changes in programming usually resulted in months and months of discussion and "processing." The end result was that programming changes rarely took place and those who

supported the changes usually got frustrated and gave up long before anything happened.⁷ [Table VII lists Alternative I's authority structure, relationship to the social environment, and incidents of conflict.]

Alternative Organization II

Located in a downtown neighborhood, Alternative II began operating in the late 1960s as a medical clinic and drug counseling center, the area's "counterculture⁸ free clinic." By 1988-89, it had changed some of its earlier focus and was now also operating a prenatal clinic for low income women, a program for homeless youth ("street kids"), and a counseling program for low-income people. The 1988 budget for the entire organization was \$600,000.00 and approximately 66 percent was government funds. The entire organization employed twenty-five people (twelve full-time and thirteen part-time). The organization's thirty-five volunteers were primarily medical practitioners, mental health professionals, and crisis counselors. During 1988, there was a staff turnover of 12 percent. I looked only at the clinic segment of the organization which had a staff of

⁷ This could be an unfortunate consequence of an ill-conceived organizational effort to avoid conflicts and confrontations such as the prior one with the African-American community.

⁸ Counterculture refers to values and mores that run counter to those of established society.

TABLE VII
ALTERNATIVE ORGANIZATION I

Authority Structure:	Modified-Hierarchy
Relationship to Social Environment:	Peripheral
Community Support:	Peripheral
-Organizational Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Average
-Board Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Narrow
Goals and Philosophy:	Peripheral
Economic Condition:	Peripheral
-Source of Funding:	Peripheral
-Financial Stability:	Moderate
Incidents of Conflict:	Seven

eight. The clinic's 1988 budget was approximately \$200,000.00.

I interviewed the "agency administrator,"⁹ a white woman who had been employed at the organization for nine years. Initially the organization's fund-raiser, she was asked to be the agency's administrator when Alternative II moved from a collective towards a hierarchy in 1983-84.

Alternative II had the longest consistent history of collective decision-making among the organizations studied. From its founding in 1968 until 1984, it had been a collectivist-democratic organization. According to the agency administrator, the change occurred because the coordinators said they could not administer their expanding programs effectively and were impatient with the time needed for collective decision-making. Time has always been one of the major constraints on organizational democracy (Mansbridge 1973; Rothschild-Whitt 1986). One white board member said that a collective decision-making model was still used whenever practical, partly because of the administrator's personal style, partly because many of the staff ". . . expect to be involved and . . . assert themselves ", and partly because the board ". . . facilitates or blesses that kind of process among the staff

⁹ Agency administrator was Alternative II's title for an executive director. This title was chosen when the organization made a change from a collectivist to a more hierarchical authority structure.

. . . ." The by-laws also require that the board share with the program coordinators the responsibility of hiring the agency administrator. In her study of rape crisis centers, Simon (1981) argued that the creation of hierarchies is not conservatizing if organizational leaders believe in egalitarianism. Alternative II seems to have preserved its egalitarian ideology.¹⁰ [Table VIII lists Alternative II's authority structure, relationship to the social environment, and incidents of conflict.]

THE MAINSTREAM ORGANIZATION

Mainstream Organization I

A community social service organization, Mainstream I was founded in 1966 to provide services to low income people in certain urban neighborhoods. It currently has programs to serve youth, seniors, and homeless families. Its 1988 budget was \$1,250,000.00 with 80 percent government funds. The entire organization had a staff of 45 to 50 people, primarily in full-time positions. Four hundred volunteers worked in its programs. I looked only at the senior program which had a staff of eight in early 1989; this program's 1988 budget was approximately \$300,000.00. The organization was the largest and most bureaucratic in the study.

¹⁰ See Jo Freeman's article "The Tyranny of Structurelessness" which discusses the limitations of "unstructured" organizations and outlines principles of democratic "structuring."

TABLE VIII
ALTERNATIVE ORGANIZATION II

Authority Structure:	Modified-Hierarchy
Relationship to Social Environment:	Semi-integrated
Community Support:	Semi-integrated
-Organizational Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Broad
-Board Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Broad
Goals and Philosophy:	Integrated
Economic Condition:	Semi-integrated
-Source of Funding:	Semi-integrated
-Financial Stability:	Moderate
Incidents of Conflict:	Two

During 1988, there was a 10 to 20 percent turnover in entire staff. There was also a high degree of turnover in the position of senior program coordinator; four individuals held the position within a two year period. For six months the white, female executive director intervened to administer the senior program herself.

Mainstream I had the lowest incidence of overt internal conflict in the study. The only conflicts mentioned were covert racial/cultural tensions. This fits with the formalized, centralized structure of the organization. Gamson and Levin (1984) argued that overt conflict is proscribed from most workplaces by the detailed differentiation of labor and the hierarchical decision-making procedures, and instead, there are latent resentments among workers. [Table IX lists Mainstream I's authority structure, relationship to the social environment, and incidents of conflict.]

SUMMARY OF ORGANIZATIONS

To summarize, these six organizations were selected because of their diverse organizational type, authority structure, and relationship to the social environment. They included three feminist organizations, two alternative organizations, and one mainstream organization. Their authority structures were either modified-hierarchies or

TABLE IX
MAINSTREAM ORGANIZATION I

Authority Structure:	Hierarchy
Relationship to Social Environment:	Integrated
Community Support:	Integrated
-Organizational Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Broad
-Board Connections to Other Community Organizations:	Broad
Goals and Philosophy:	Integrated
Economic Condition:	Integrated
-Source of Funding:	Integrated
-Financial Stability:	High
Incidents of Conflict:	Two

hierarchies and their relationship to the social environment was either peripheral, semi-integrated, or integrated.¹¹ These organizations experienced varying amounts of internal conflict.

¹¹ Table X presents a summary of the dimensions of the two independent variables. Table XI presents the authority structure by organizational type and Table XII presents the relationship to the social environment by organizational type. Table XIII presents the organizations by both authority structure and relationship to the social environment.

TABLE X
ORGANIZATION BY AUTHORITY STRUCTURE BY
RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

	<u>Organizations</u>					
	<u>Feminist</u>			<u>Alternative</u>		<u>Main</u>
	I	II	III	I	II	I
AS*	MH	H	MH	MH	MH	H
RSE**	Per	SI	Per	Per	SI	I
CS**	Per	SI	Per	Per	SI	I
-OC+	N	A	N	N	B	B
-BC+	N	B	N	N	B	B
GP**	Per	I	Per	Per	I	I
EC**	Per	SI	Per	Per	SI	I
-SF**	Per	SI	Per	Per	SI	I
-FS***	Low	Mod	Low	Mod	Mod	Hi

*MH=Modified-Hierarchy, H=Hierarchy

**Per=Peripheral, SI=Semi-integrated, I=Integrated

+N=Narrow, A=Average, B=Broad

***Low, Mod=Moderate, Hi=High

AS=Authority Structure

RSE=Relationship to Social Environment

CS=Community Support

OC=Organizational Connections to Other Community

Organizations

BC=Board Connections to Other Community Organizations

GP=Goals and Philosophy

EC=Economic Condition

SF=Source of Funding

FS=Financial Stability

TABLE XI
AUTHORITY STRUCTURE BY
ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

<u>Type</u>	<u>Authority Structure</u>	
	<u>Modified-Hierarchy</u>	<u>Hierarchy</u>
Feminist	Fem I Fem III	Fem II
Alternative	Alt I Alt II	
Mainstream		Main I

TABLE XII
RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT
BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

<u>Type</u>	<u>Relationship to Social Environment</u>		
	<u>Peripheral</u>	<u>Semi-integrated</u>	<u>Integrated</u>
Feminist	Fem I Fem III	Fem II	
Alternative	Alt I	Alt II	
Mainstream			Main I

TABLE XIII
 ORGANIZATIONS BY AUTHORITY STRUCTURE AND
 RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

	<u>Modified-Hierarchy</u>	<u>Hierarchy</u>
Peripheral	Fem I Fem III Alt I	---
Semi- Integrated	Alt II	Fem II
Integrated	---	Main I

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents analyses of the relationship between the incidence, intensity, and extent of internal organizational conflict and the two independent variables: a) authority structure and b) relationship to the social environment, and the mediating variable: c) organizational culture. Based on my analyses, I concluded that:

1) the more hierarchical the organization and the more integrated it is with the social environment, the fewer incidents of internal conflict it experiences, and the less severe these incidents are in intensity and extent;

2) the more prosperous an organization and the more stable its funding, the fewer incidents of internal conflict it experiences, and the less severe these incidents are in intensity and extent;

3) the following characteristics of organizational culture: a) cohesive social relations, b) an ideology of social change, and c) a board of directors involved in daily program operations are associated with a high incidence of internal conflict;

4) the following characteristics of organizational culture: a) ideological homogeneity and b) written policies,

procedures, and job descriptions are associated with a low incidence of conflict;

5) feminist organizations with nonhierarchical authority structures and peripheral relationships to the social environment experience more incidents of conflict and/or ones higher in intensity and extent than feminist organizations with hierarchical authority structures and semi-integrated or integrated relationships to the social environment.

In conclusion, the chapter presents some speculations about organizational characteristics not addressed in the research hypotheses.

ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT

Hypothesis I: Organizations with modified-hierarchical authority structures are more likely to experience internal conflicts than organizations with hierarchical authority structures.

Hypothesis II: Organizations with peripheral relationships to the social environment are more likely to experience internal conflicts than organizations with semi-integrated or integrated relationships to the social environment.

Hypothesis III: Modified-hierarchical organizations with peripheral relationships to the social environment are more likely to experience internal conflict than

hierarchical organizations with semi-integrated or integrated relationships to the social environment.

The data show that:

1) The three peripheral, modified-hierarchical organizations experienced more incidents of conflict than the other three organizations (see Table XIV). These incidents ranged from low to high in intensity and extent.

2) The semi-integrated, hierarchical organization (Feminist II) had two incidents of conflict and one incident was high in intensity and extent.

3) The semi-integrated, modified-hierarchical organization (Alternative II) and the integrated, hierarchical organization (Mainstream I) each had two incidents of conflict which were low in intensity and extent.

Table XV lists the predicted and actual incidence of conflict in the six organizations. The three peripheral, modified-hierarchical organizations (Feminist I, Feminist III, and Alternative I) experienced a predicted high rank of incidents of conflict and the integrated, hierarchical organization (Mainstream I) had a predicted low rank of incidents of conflict. At the semi-integrated, hierarchical organization (Feminist II), one of its two incidents of conflict was higher than predicted in intensity and extent. At the semi-integrated, modified-hierarchical organization

TABLE XIV
INCIDENCE OF CONFLICT BY ORGANIZATION

<u>Organization</u>	<u>RSE*</u>	<u>AS**</u>	<u>No. of Incidents</u>
Alternative I	Per	MH	Seven
Feminist I	Per	MH	Five
Feminist III	Per	MH	Four
Feminist II	SI	H	Two
Alternative II	SI	MH	Two
Mainstream I	I	H	Two

* RSE=Relationship to the Social Environment;
Per=Peripheral, SI=Semi-integrated, I=Integrated
** AS=Authority Structure; MH=Modified-Hierarchy,
H=Hierarchy

TABLE XV
ORGANIZATIONS BY RANK ORDER
OF INCIDENCE OF CONFLICT*

	<u>Expected Rank</u>	<u>Actual Rank</u>	
<u>Conflict</u>			
High	Feminist I	Alternative I	(7)
	Feminist III	Feminist III	(5)
	Alternative I	Feminist I	(4)
	Alternative II	Feminist II	(2)
	Feminist II	Alternative II	(2)
Low	Mainstream I	Mainstream I	(2)

* This list does not describe the intensity and extent of each incident of conflict.

(Alternative II), there was a lower than predicted incidence of conflict with lower than predicted intensity and extent.

Intensity, Extent & Type of Conflict

Table XVI lists the incidents of conflict at each organization, identifies the intensity, and extent of each incident and its type of conflict. The three peripheral, modified-hierarchical organizations (Feminist I, Feminist III and Alternative I) had more incidents of conflict and incidents of higher intensity and extent than the other three organizations. Additionally, Feminist II had one incident of conflict which was high in intensity.

The incidents of conflict were divided into five types. There were nine incidents of conflict typed as staff vs. staff. These were conflicts between individual staff members and/or groups of staff; in some cases, the director was aligned with a portion of the staff. There were six incidents of conflict typed as staff/board vs. staff/board. These were conflicts involving two factions of the organization's members. There were three incidents typed as miscellaneous. They were conflicts between one individual and the other organizational members or conflicts between volunteers and the rest of the organizational members. At most of the organizations, the volunteers were aligned with the staff, director, or board. Only at Alternative I, which has approximately 300 volunteers, were the volunteers ever involved in an incident of conflict as a separate faction.

TABLE XVI
INCIDENTS OF CONFLICT BY INTENSITY
AND EXTENT BY TYPE OF CONFLICT

<u>Organization</u>		<u>Intensity</u>	<u>Extent</u>	<u>Type of Conflict</u>
	<u>Incidents</u>			
Fem I	1)	High	Moderate	staff-board
	2)	Moderate	Moderate	staff-staff
	3)	Moderate	Moderate	staff-staff
	4)	Mod	Low	misc.
	5)	Low	Low	staff-staff
Fem II	1)*	High	High	director-staff
	2)	Low	Low	staff-staff
Fem III	1)*	High**	High	director-staff
	2)	High	Moderate	misc.
	3)	Moderate	Moderate	staff-board
	4)	Low	Low	staff/board- staff/board
Alt I	1)	Moderate	Moderate	staff-staff
	2)	Moderate	Moderate	staff/board- staff/board
	3)	Moderate	Moderate	"
	4)	Low	Low	"
	5)+	Low	Low	misc.
	6)	Low	Low	staff/board- staff/board
	7)	Moderate	Low	"
Alt II	1)	Low	Low	staff-staff
	2)	Moderate	Low	staff-staff
Main I	1)	Low	Low	staff-staff
	2)	Low	Low	staff-staff

* The most intense and extensive conflicts occurred when the entire staff was in conflict with the director (regardless of board involvement).

+ Alternative I had a large body of volunteers (200-300). It was the only organization in which the volunteers represented a separate faction.

** This is the only conflict which resulted in a loss of funding.

There were two incidents typed as staff vs. board. They were conflicts between either a portion of the staff and the board or the entire staff and the board; if involved, the director was aligned with the staff. There were two incidents typed as director vs. staff. These were conflicts between most or all of the staff and the director; if involved, the board was either aligned with one faction or split between them. The most intense and extensive conflicts occurred when the entire staff was in conflict with the director, regardless of board involvement. A conflict between the staff and director at Feminist III was the only incident in the study which resulted in a loss of a portion of the organization's funding.

AUTHORITY STRUCTURE

Hypothesis I predicted that organizations with modified-hierarchical authority structures would experience more incidents of conflict than organizations with hierarchical authority structures. As shown in Table XVII, modified-hierarchical organizations did experience more conflict than hierarchical organizations.

However, one of the modified-hierarchical organizations (Alternative II) had neither a high incidence of conflict nor high intensity and extent in these conflicts. Also, one of the hierarchical organizations (Feminist II) experienced one conflict with high intensity and extent. Therefore, by

TABLE XVII
INCIDENCE OF REPORTED CONFLICT
BY AUTHORITY STRUCTURE

<u>Authority Structure</u>	<u>Incidence of Conflict</u>	
	<u>Average</u>	<u>N</u>
Modified Hierarchy N=4	4.5	(18)
Hierarchy N=2	2.0	(4)

itself, authority structure is not always associated with a high incidence of conflict.

RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Hypothesis II predicted that organizations with peripheral relationships to the social environment would experience more incidents of conflict than organizations with semi-integrated or integrated relationships to the social environment. Table XVIII shows that peripheral organizations had more conflicts than either semi-integrated or integrated organizations. However, a) the single semi-integrated, hierarchical organization (Feminist II) experienced one incident which had higher than predicted intensity and extent, and b) the semi-integrated, modified-hierarchical organization (Alternative II) had fewer than predicted incidents of conflict with lower than predicted intensity and extent.

Economic Condition

An organization's economic resources are a key indicator of the amount of internal conflict. This is in accord with the resource mobilization proposition that access to economic resources is a major ingredient in the success of social movement organizations (McCarthy & Zald 1973, 1977). All the organizations whose economic conditions were peripheral experienced a high incidence of conflict.

TABLE XVIII

INCIDENCE OF REPORTED CONFLICT BY RELATIONSHIP
TO SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

<u>Relationship to Social Environment</u>	<u>Incidence of Conflict</u>	
	<u>Average</u>	<u>N</u>
Peripheral N=3	5.1	(16)
Semi-integrated N=2	2.0	(4)
Integrated N=1	2.0	(2)

Two of the peripheral organizations (Feminist I and Feminist II) suffered budget cuts which forced them to slash both services and staff. A lowered level of funding at these organizations decreased wages, caused staff shortages and high staff turnover, and diminished their ability to maintain adequate facilities and equipment. The inability to pay competitive wages meant that organizations could not attract qualified personnel. A Feminist I administrator, admitting it was difficult to retain staff because of the low wages, described her organization as a training ground for women. Many staff members came with few skills and left for better paying jobs after acquiring more marketable skills.

Community Support

In addition to access to financial resources, connections to individuals and organizations in the community predicts for the successful achievement of organizational goals (McCarthy & Zald 1977; Rothschild-Whitt 1986). Hypothesis II predicted that organizations with integrated relationships to the social environment would experience less conflict with less intensity and extent than organizations with peripheral relationships to the social environment. The data substantiate this hypothesis, since organizations with integrated community support had fewer incidents of conflict and lower intensity and extent than

organizations with peripheral or semi-integrated community support.

Goals and Philosophy

The data supported the prediction that peripheral (i.e., social change) goals and philosophy are associated with a high incidence of conflict and high intensity and extent of conflict. All the organizations with peripheral goals and philosophy had more incidents of conflict than the organizations with integrated goals and philosophy.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Organizational culture mediates between the organization's authority structure, its relationship to the social environment, and the incidence, intensity, and extent of internal conflict. First, the organizational culture supports the existence and continuation of specific authority structures. Second, it affects the organization's relationship to the social environment by: a) shaping community perceptions of the organization's goals and philosophy and b) influencing community attitudes towards the organization and, thus, the community's social and financial support of the organization. Third, the source of funding is affected by the organizational culture since many funding agencies do not want to support organizations with social change goals (Schechter 1982:95).

The mediating influence of organizational culture is especially visible in the peripheral organizations in the study. For example, peripheral organizations have narrow organization and board connections to other community organizations and receive much of their support from like-minded individuals and organizations which are a minority in the community. Peripheral organizations also have more difficulties than integrated ones obtaining support from common funding sources. Finally, members of peripheral organizations may be skeptical about accepting money from funding sources whose "politics" are not aligned with those of the organization. At Alternative I, a community radio station, "underwriting"¹ was a conflictual topic. Some individuals feared that the station would become dependent on the financial support of "underwriters," and that certain issues might be circumvented in order to placate these individuals or organizations.

Characteristics Associated with a High Incidence of Conflict

Hypothesis IV: Organizations with an organizational culture which includes: a) expectations of collective-decision making, b) cohesive relationships among its members, c) an ideology of social change, and d) a board of directors who are involved in daily program operations are

¹ Underwriters are businesses and individuals that donate money to the station and are credited "on the air" for their support.

more likely to experience internal conflicts than organizations with an organizational culture which does not include these four characteristics.

Expectations of Collective Decision-Making. This indicator was not associated with a high incidence of conflict. At times, it appeared that the actual indicator of the incidence of internal conflict was the alignment between the staff's expectations that collective decision-making procedures be used and the reality that the organization used them. Some expectations that collective decision-making procedures would be used were present at all the organizations except Mainstream I. However, expectations often clashed with the reality of how decisions were actually made in the organizations. These discrepancies between expectations and reality laid the groundwork for internal tensions and conflict.

At Feminist I and Feminist III, many staff believed that decisions should be made collectively. In reality, neither of the organizations' executive directors used collective decision-making procedures. At Feminist III, the director said she used collective decision-making procedures when it was convenient, but that they usually took too much time. At both these organizations, where the use of collective decision-making procedures was dependent on the directors' inclinations, many staff and volunteers were

frustrated and perturbed. This lead to increased tensions and confrontations between staff members and the director.

At Alternative II, staff expectations that collective decision-making procedures would be used were realized because the staff participated in the decision-making procedures. However, in some organizations with an alignment between the expectations and the reality of decision-making procedures, there was a high incidence of conflict. Two organizations (Feminist II and Alternative I), which had this alignment, had either a high incidence of conflict or an incident which was high in intensity and/or extent. Therefore, neither the expectations of collective decision-making nor the alignment between the expectations and the reality of collective decision-making procedures were associated with a high incidence of conflict.

Social Relations. Cohesive social relations was related to a high incidence of conflict. The staff and volunteers at the three feminist organizations had higher expectations of social cohesiveness than individuals at the other organizations. A Feminist II staff member said,

[at] this kind of agency . . . you have to get along with everybody We have one staff member who is just a little bit over here and we're always working and exerting energy to bring that person closer and closer and closer . . . in; not to change her, but to bring her in [to the] . . . circle.

However, the staff member who was not part of the "circle" said she was not interested in socializing with the rest of the staff. At other organizations, certain groups of staff and volunteers may have socialized, but it did not seem there were any expectations that cohesiveness was necessary.

Individuals who are overidentified with an organization can exacerbate organizational conflicts. Often, individuals may choose to stay and voice their dissatisfaction rather than leave the organization. This may occur because the organization offers them incentives which are not readily available elsewhere. This occurred at Feminist III when the staff, board, and volunteers were divided into two factions which could find no grounds for compromise. This cleavage transformed internal tensions into major confrontations in which the two factions took extreme and "irrational" stances. Given the higher incidence of conflict in peripheral organizations, it could be argued that individuals are more likely to stay and voice their dissatisfaction in organizations with social change ideologies. Berger & Zald (1978:832) suggested that this is because these organizations offer an intrinsic reward to their members: the opportunity to participate daily in a social movement organization. This was the case at Feminist III and the other peripheral organizations.

Ideology. Ideology is important because it ". . . supports organizational goals and justifies . . . actions

engaged by members" (Tierney 1979:160). Social change ideology was related to an increased incidence of internal conflict at all the organizations. At two of the peripheral organizations (Feminist I and Feminist III), members disagreed about whether social change was a legitimate organizational goal. This disagreement was predominantly between staff and board members. A Feminist III volunteer and board member said,

Boards are more alike than different: they tend to be very conservative. It's exacerbated, especially in a feminist organization, where you are trying to forment . . . major social change, to have a board of directors that doesn't have that kind of commitment; [who] are, in fact, very, very adverse to radicalism The problem is systemic in the creation of corporations . . . and it is just exacerbated in the women's movement.

Board Role in the Organization. Organizations where the board of directors was involved in daily program operations had a higher incidence of conflict than organizations where the board assumed a "traditional" role. At the three peripheral, modified-hierarchical organizations (Feminist I, Feminist III, and Alternative I), the board of directors was involved in the daily operations of the organization. The only organization with a "traditional" board of directors that had a high incidence of conflict was Feminist II.

At Feminist III, which experienced some of the most intense and extensive incidents of conflict, the board of directors was frequently involved in the daily operations of

the organization. Staff members, bypassing the director, regularly went to the board with complaints and problems. In one situation, a board member negotiated a contract without the director's knowledge. Part of the board, in conjunction with the staff, also attempted to terminate the director without giving their reasons to the rest of the board. At Feminist I, many interviewees believed that the board of directors did not allow the director any autonomy. The board at Alternative I was also regularly involved in decisions about both hiring and programming.

Susan Schechter (1980) perceived boards of directors as a "reoccurring shelter problem," which she called a political dilemma. The women's liberation movement had a "vision" of how its members would interact and failed to realize that some members would consider being on a board a position of power.

Many people told me that they felt compelled to put the community on their board. But when we look more closely, the community is a certain part of the community - the middle class professionals with good connections for money and resources. But, again, money and resources are not only things; they are embodied in people with a certain status and world view, a view of how organizations and people should function (Schechter 1980:98).

Characteristics Associated with a Low Incidence of Conflict

Hypothesis V: Organizations which are ideological homogeneous and/or have written policies, procedures, and job descriptions are less likely to experience internal conflicts than organizations which are ideological

heterogeneous and/or do not have written policies, procedures, and job descriptions.

Ideological Range. Ideological homogeneity was associated with a low incidence of conflict or, conversely, ideological heterogeneity was associated with a high incidence of conflict at all the organizations. One of the peripheral organizations (Alternative I), the two semi-integrated organizations (Feminist II and Alternative II), and the integrated organization (Mainstream I) were ideologically homogeneous. All four of these organizations either experienced a low incidence of conflict, or, if they had a high incidence of conflict, had no incidents which were high in intensity or extent. Two of the peripheral organizations (Feminist I and Feminist III) were ideologically heterogeneous and had a high incidence of conflict with high intensity and/or extent.

At those organizations which were homogeneous (Feminist II, Alternative I, Alternative II, and Mainstream I) there was little disagreement about organizational goals or philosophy. At all these organizations, except the peripheral one (Alternative I), the organizational ideology rarely challenged dominant societal beliefs. Thus, ideological homogeneity was easily attained. Individuals seldom had to reevaluate their personal belief systems when joining these organizations.

The low incidence of conflict at these organizations suggests that one source of conflict may be tensions over organizational goals and philosophy. When an Alternative II board member was asked about the organization's low incidence of conflict, he said,

. . . we have certain things [which] are real clear litmus tests for people who want to come on to the board The one thing that has kept us glued together are the values that the agency has developed and shared We don't particularly value hierarchies, we only accept them to the extent that they are necessary to get the business done, and even then they are supposed to be conducted in a participatory and consensus kind of model. Even more important . . . is getting ideological and value homogeneity among the staff and the board members

At Alternative I, the one peripheral organization that was ideologically homogeneous, there was basic agreement among its members about organizational goals and philosophy, despite the other disagreements and tensions. Most members supported the organization's goal of ". . . providing a forum for unpopular or obscure subjects across the political spectrum, and seeking out controversial or neglected perspectives on important issues" (Alternative I's programming charter).

Two of the peripheral organizations (Feminist I and Feminist III) were ideologically heterogeneous. There was disagreement over organizational goals and philosophy at both these organizations. A Feminist II staff member said,

The central issue, all the way down the line, has been about vision. It's such personal work, with such hazy definitions Most of these

major, large scale conflicts have to do with vision; have to do with "I see what we need to do and I know how we've got to get there and you're not doing it"

Disagreement over goals and philosophy exists in many feminist organizations. Many women ". . . erroneously assumed that everyone . . . shared the same goals and perspectives . . . [and] frequently felt betrayed when they found themselves in angry confrontations over values and politics" (Schechter 1982:104).

Individuals who joined Feminist I and Feminist III were more likely to be confronted with values or beliefs which upset them than individuals at the other four organizations. Furthermore, staff members at Feminist I and Feminist III were more likely than board members to have personal values which were aligned with the organization's philosophy or were more willing than board members to realign their personal values. The latter more often rejected the organization's philosophy, possibly because they spent less time than the staff with the organization.

These differences in staff and board ideologies often produced conflicts between the board and the staff. Such differences occurred frequently in rape crisis centers, battered women's shelters, and other feminist organizations:

Many board members . . . were invited to join boards without any knowledge of nontraditional organizations or battered women. Many people without direct experiences in shelters that politicized early supporters were sought as board members; they had valuable contacts for fund-raising or essential skills which shelters could never afford to purchase. Their

personal and political resources and connections to mainstream organizations were essential to ensure shelter survival.

Some shelters failed to recognize that boards could wield considerable power. Clashes were inevitable and often erupted in the middle of a fiscal or personnel crisis when the board, seeing itself as legally responsible for the shelter, moved to 'straighten out the mess' as they perceived it Disagreements also emerged over models for helping battered women, with the board emphasizing traditional counseling approaches and the staff stressing self-help (Schechter 1982:100-101).

There is an association between ideological homogeneity and the success of collectivist-democratic organizations (Gamson & Levin 1984; Mansbridge 1982; Rothschild-Whitt 1986). The lack of ideological homogeneity and the high incidence of conflict in two of the four modified-hierarchical organizations (Feminist I and Feminist III) supports this. The other two modified-hierarchies (Alternative I and Alternative II) were ideologically homogeneous. Alternative I had basic agreement about its goals and philosophy and none of its incidents of conflict were high in intensity or extent. Alternative II, the organization with the most ideological homogeneity, was the only one of the four modified-hierarchies which had both a low incidence of conflict and low intensity and extent.

Written Policies, Procedures, and Job Descriptions.

Alternative II and Mainstream I, the two organizations with the fewest conflicts and the lowest intensity or extent of conflict, were bureaucratized the most. Each possessed

comprehensive organizational documents, including but not limited to personnel policies, procedure manuals, and job descriptions. Staff members at these organizations believed that having these written documents was one reason for the low incidence of conflict. The data confirm this conclusion.

At these two organizations, lengthy written documents served different functions. The documents at the semi-integrated, modified-hierarchical organization (Alternative II) were part of a "common culture" (Gamson & Levin 1984). These documents supplied everyone with an understanding of organizational expectations. According to a long-time Alternative II board member, the board was always revising the personnel policies. Revision of rules to meet members' needs is a characteristic of collectivist-democratic organizations (Rothschild-Whitt 1986).

At Mainstream I, comprehensive written documents typified its integrated, hierarchical structure. The ideal type of a hierarchical-bureaucratic organization includes ". . . the formalization of fixed and universalistic rules; [the] calculability and appeal of decisions on the basis of correspondence to the formal, written law" (Rothschild-Whitt 1986:37).

The ideal type of a collectivist-democratic organization includes: "minimal stipulated rules; primacy of ad hoc, individuated decisions" (Ibid). At the four other

organizations (Feminist I, Feminist II, Feminist III, and Alternative I), the lack of written organizational documents was associated with a high incidence of conflict or with conflicts with high intensity and/or extent. The existence of "minimal rules" works well when there was a consensus of opinions among members in a small organization, but it creates a tremendous potential for conflict when disagreements occurred. Increased routinization and formalization is often a reaction to internal conflicts. Early in the women's liberation movement, Jo Freeman (1973) addressed the need for increased organizational structure as feminist organizations decided to pursue specific goals and activities.

A COMPARISON OF ORGANIZATIONS

The research data show that:

- 1) the two peripheral, modified-hierarchical feminist organizations (Feminist I and Feminist III) experienced more incidents of conflict and/or incidents which were higher in intensity and extent than the semi-integrated, hierarchical feminist organization (Feminist II);
- 2) in most cases, the feminist organizations were more likely to have peripheral economic conditions than the alternative and mainstream organizations;
- 3) an organization's economic condition and social change goals and philosophy were two of the primary

indicators of a peripheral relationship to the social environment.

Feminist I had five incidents of conflict, ranging from low to high in intensity and extent. Feminist III had four incidents of conflict, ranging from low to high in intensity and extent. Feminist II had two incidents of conflict; one of which was high in intensity and extent. The data support the hypothesis that more hierarchical organizations and ones more integrated with the social environment had less conflict and less intense and extensive conflict.

The economic conditions of the three feminist organizations and the peripheral, alternative organization (Alternative I) were more financially unstable than those of the semi-integrated, alternative organization (Alternative II) and the integrated, mainstream organization. This unstable economic condition was correlated with social change goals and philosophy. The two peripheral feminist organizations (Feminist I and Feminist III) and the peripheral alternative organization (Alternative I) espoused a social change philosophy. The third feminist organization (Feminist II), while not pursuing social change goals, dealt with the marginally accepted issue of battered women. Having a feminist philosophy in itself does not create an organizational culture conducive to increased internal conflict. However, having social change goals or dealing with marginally accepted social issues can result in a

peripheral relationship to the social environment which is conducive to increased internal conflicts.

SPECULATIONS

Before concluding this chapter, there are four subjects, not included in the research hypotheses, which I would like to explore: 1) the impact of urban versus suburban locations, 2) the impact of being embedded in a larger institution, 3) staff turnover, and 4) techniques which organizations use to control or manage conflict. These explorations and speculations could be grounds for future research.

Urban vs. Suburban Location

Feminist II was the only organization in the study located in a suburban area. Because it needed to survive in a more conservative setting than the other feminist organizations and because it was a product of this more conservative location, Feminist II did not espouse a social change philosophy. The lack of like-minded individuals and organizations means that suburban and rural feminist organizations often need to garner broader community support than do comparable urban feminist organizations (Schechter 1982:49). This support was evident in the broad community representation on Feminist II's board of directors. In addition to having wide community support, Feminist II was

also the only feminist organization in the study which allowed men to serve on the board of directors.²

Embeddedness in Another Institution

Two of the organizations in the study were embedded in larger institutions: Alternative II and Mainstream I. These two organizations experienced the lowest incidence of conflict. It can be speculated that being embedded in another larger institution might both increase an organization's economic stability and broaden its community support. Hence, an organization's relationship to the social environment would become more integrated and the likelihood of internal conflicts would decrease.

Staff Turnover

Staff turnover is a complex issue. Staff turnover may be the product of organizational conflict or organizational conflict may increase staff turnover. All the organizations with a high incidence of conflict also experienced high staff turnover. Five of the organizations also experienced a turnover in leadership. In some cases, it appeared that financial instability and its correlates (e.g. low wages, job insecurity, inadequate staffing, and substandard equipment and facilities) produced high staff turnover. In

² See Susan Schechter's (1982:258-67) discussion about the issues surrounding men's involvement in the battered women's movement.

other cases, turnover occurred for other unrelated reasons (e.g. better job opportunities or personal life changes).

The degree of turnover can also be related to whether an individual choses to express her dissatisfaction by "voicing" it or by leaving the organization (see Berger & Zald 1978). If members are highly "invested" in the organization, then lower levels of turnover may correlate with a higher incidence of internal conflict because members may stay and "fight" when problems occur. If members are less "invested," they may chose to leave when tensions increased.

Controlling Conflict

In some organizations, internal conflicts remained at manageable levels. A high incidence of conflict, but low or moderate intensity and extent of conflict, seems to indicate that the incidence of conflict is being managed or controlled somehow.

Alternative I, in particular, appeared to have many techniques for managing conflict. Its large membership (200-300 active volunteers and 3000 local subscribers, representing a wide variety of constituencies, including numerous racial and ethnic groups, a mix of progressive political views, and an assortment of lifestyles) seemed to have been an important factor in the outcome of conflicts. This diversity may have created an organizational culture with a great tolerance for differences. Underlying all the

differences, there was basic ideological support for the organization's progressive goals and philosophy.

In addition, power at Alternative I may have been widely dispersed, as seen in the numerous opinions among the staff and volunteers about who had power. Many volunteers believed that the staff and board held most of the power. Conversely, the staff said they felt powerless and, at times, caught between the board and the volunteers. One longtime volunteer and ex-staff member said,

. . . there was an inherent contradiction: you're paid to be the staff person, . . . to be responsible, . . . [and] make decisions. Yet, at the same time, you're beholden to a board of directors who change like the weather On the other side, . . . [you] are responsible to volunteers who make up the bulk of the workforce, sit on a lot of committees, and have quite a bit of influence over whether or not anything staff wants to do is effective

So you have this contradiction: you're suppose to be an authority, but you have very little of it and what . . . you do have is within circumscribed boundaries. Those boundaries constantly erode or expand depending on the person in the staff position: how long they've been there, how much the board trusts or doesn't trust them, how much the volunteers like or don't like or trust them There's so much politicking required to do anything because you've got to please all these constituents: if you don't please the volunteers, they're just not going to do it; if you don't please the board, they're going to enact some new rule that stops you from doing it.

Alternative I's unique authority structure also made it difficult to identify who had power. The board was elected from and by the membership, rather than recruited by staff and board members. Thus, rather than being "top-down," the

flow of power was more circular. Also, the board was involved in all decision-making, especially the hiring of staff members and/or programming changes.

In my view, the Alternative I board of directors held the majority of power, in contrast to "traditional" organizations where the director, and possibly the staff, hold the most power. According to Gamson (1975), the centralization of power in an organization is a mechanism which minimizes internal conflicts. Thus, the making or approval of decisions by a board of directors selected by the staff and members may have reduced conflicts.

The cumbersome and lengthy procedures used to make decisions also diffused conflict at Alternative I. A constant strain existed between "newcomers" who supported programming changes and "oldtimers" who wanted to maintain the status quo. Volunteers usually had more tenure at the station than staff members, so they resisted any attempts by the staff or board to change the programming. A former staff member said there had traditionally been a "grandfather clause" about programming: ". . . you're on the air until you die."

SUMMARY

This chapter discusses the data analyses. This analyses concludes that the more hierarchical an organization's authority structure is, and the more

integrated the organization is with the social environment, the less internal conflict it will experience. The conflict that does occur will be less intense and extensive.

Feminist organizations experience a higher incidence of conflict, with higher intensity and extent, because they are likely to have nonhierarchical authority structures and peripheral relationships to the social environment.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study, critiques resource mobilization theory, and makes some recommendations for reducing internal conflicts that threaten the existence of organizations.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

The analyses support the hypothesis that nonhierarchical organizations with peripheral relationships to the social environment are more likely to experience destructive internal conflicts. An organization's economic condition and its goals and philosophy are primary indicators of its relationship to the social environment. Furthermore, an ideology of social change, cohesive social relations, and a board of directors involved in daily program operations are associated with a high incidence of conflict. Ideological homogeneity and written policies, procedures, and job descriptions are associated with a low incidence of conflict.

Feminist organizations are more likely than other organizations to experience internal conflicts because they are more likely to have: a) nonhierarchical authority

structures, b) peripheral relationships to the social environment, c) an ideology of social change, d) cohesive social relations, e) a board who is involved in daily program operations, f) ideological heterogeneity, and g) a lack of written organizational documents. There is nothing inherent in feminism or in women's organizations which increases the likelihood of destructive internal conflict.

CRITIQUE OF RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

The resource mobilization perspective equates organizational success with organizational survival. This view of success does not consider that many social movement goals and social movement organization goals are coopted on the road to "success." Unfortunately, using the achievement of goals as a measure of success results in a bias which favors social movements with limited goals, since those with extensive goals are more likely to fail (Gamson 1968). This limiting of organizational goals is evident in Tierney's (1979) research on battered women's shelters. She concluded that, in their efforts to survive, shelters changed their original goals primarily because of community pressures.

Rothschild-Whitt (1982:76-84) presented a different position on organizational survival in her work on collectivist-democratic organizations. She believed there is a basic, unrecognized assumption in organizational theory that organizations all strive for permanence. She found

that a unique characteristic of collectivist-democratic organizations was their "provisional orientation" which existed for three reasons:

a) Members often see these organizations as a vehicle for the achievement of a particular social movement's goals. When the organization either fails to meet these goals or attains them, the organization no longer has a purpose.

b) The provisional attitude is rooted in members' realizations that, as well as founding the organization, they also have the power to disband the organization.

c) The provisional stance may also be a reflection of the values of the 1960s "counterculture" which was characterized as "present-oriented."

Rothschild-Whitt discovered that many collectivist-democratic organizations preferred to dissolve the organizations rather than have their goals coopted. None of the six organizations in the study had a provisional orientation. The struggle for organizational survival and success often forced organizations into situations which produced internal conflict. For example, conflicts about an organization's goals and philosophy often resulted from its need to adapt to funding agency's expectations in order to receive financial support.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEMINIST ORGANIZATIONS

My research leads me to some recommendations for organizations that want to decrease their destructive internal conflicts:

1) To guide financial planning and fund-raising efforts, an organization must set clear goals about its purpose and how this purpose affects organizational activities. A solid economic condition should to be the first consideration for new or struggling organizations.

Efforts to acquire stable financial support should be guided by the following realizations: a) Funding is often accompanied by expectations that an organization's goals and philosophy will become realigned to match those of the funding agency. b) Organizations with peripheral goals and philosophy have difficulties acquiring financial support from a majority of funding agencies. c) Conflicts between external expectations and an organization's goals and philosophy are endemic to feminist and alternative organizations.

Tierney (1982:216-17) foresaw two convergent trends in the battered women's movement: a) an increasing move towards conventional, social service oriented programs and a declining emphasis on feminist concerns and b) the greatest success in getting social and financial support in feminist organizations with "goals, ideologies and modes of functioning that are compatible with those of the broadest

range of potential supporters." She also predicted an erosion of support for feminist programs as "the interest of the media, politicians and professionals wanes." These organizational changes and the waning of community support are evident at the feminist organizations which I studied.

Members of feminist organizations must consider and decide if they are willing to accept the cooptation of their organizational goals and the decreasing support for their programs. Decisions should be made about a) what services the program can continue to provide and b) whether the organization can work for social change within its existing structure. Feminist organizations could consider developing separate components to provide services and to conduct political or social change activities. These two components could be funded and administered separately. To do this, the women's liberation movement needs to recruit new activists and revitalize old ones. Decreasing funds and funders' disapproval of social change activities mean that money will not be available to pay staff members to do all that is necessary and volunteers will be more important than ever.

2) Efforts to assure ideological homogeneity among organizational members could reduce the amount of destructive internal conflicts. Ideological homogeneity is a major factor in controlling internal conflicts.

Recruiting homogenous board members, staff, and volunteers and increasing ideological homogeneity among existing organizational members should decrease internal conflicts. Agreement between the board of directors and other organizational members, though possibly the most difficult to achieve, may be the most significant in the reduction of destructive internal conflicts. Frequently, organizations recruit board members because of their financial expertise or community contacts. This recruitment often occurs without attention to ideological homogeneity. Consequently, there may be differences between the values and philosophies of the board members and those of other organizational members. When recruiting board members, an organization's members must weigh the advantages of board members who can expand the organization's financial stability and community contacts against the disadvantages of a lack of homogeneity among organizational members.

3) Maintaining written organizational documents and records is another mechanism for reducing organizational conflict. This is important in organizations with a high degree of turnover, since written documents are one means of giving new members information about organizational activities, expectations, and goals. The routinization and formalization of an organization also assists members in dealing with the interpersonal conflicts which are often difficult to handle.

4) My conclusions about cooptation and goal displacement among social movement organizations leads to a final recommendation for feminist organizations. Rape crisis centers, battered women's shelters, and other feminist organizations should begin a national discussion about: a) whether the existing organizations are achieving their desired goals; b) the possible dissolution of organizations which are not achieving the goals of the women's liberation movement; and c) the possible creation of more provisional social movement organizations which are specifically devoted to political and social change activities.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahrens, Lois. 1980. "Battered Women's Refuges: Feminist Cooperatives vs. Social Service Institutions." Radical America 14(3):41-47.
- Andler, Judith and Sullivan, Gail. 1980. "The price of government funding." Aegis (Winter/Spring):10-15.
- Aveni, Adrian. 1978. "Organizational linkages and resource mobilization." Sociological Quarterly 19:185-202.
- Baker, Andrea J. 1986. "The Problem of Authority in Radical Movement Groups: a Case Study of Lesbian-feminist Organization." Contemporary Studies in Applied Behavioral Sciences 4:135-155.
- Bernstein, Paul. 1976. "Necessary Elements for Effective Worker Participation in Decision-Making." Journal of Economic Issues 10:490-522.
- Brager, George and Holloway, Stephen. 1978. Changing Human Services Organizations: Politics and Practice. New York: Free Press.
- Coleman, James. 1957. "Community Conflict." A Publication of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Davidson, Leonard. 1982. "Countercultural Organizations and Bureaucracy: Limits on the Revolution." In Social Movements of the 60s and the 70s, pp. 162-176. Edited by Jo Freeman. New York: Longman.
- Eisenstein, Hester. 1983. Contemporary Feminist Thought. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co.
- Evans, Sara. 1980. Personal Politics. New York: Vintage Books.
- Ferguson, Kathy. 1984. The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferraro, Kathleen J. 1981. "Processing Battered Women." Journal of Family Issues 2(4):415-438.

- Ferree, Myra Marx and Hess, Beth B. 1985. Controversary and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement. Boston: Twayne.
- Fine, Michelle. 1985. "Unearthing Contradictions: An Essay Inspired by Women and Male Violence." Feminist Studies 11(2):391-407.
- Freeman, Jo. 1973. "Tyranny of Structureless." MS, July 1973, pp. 76-78, 86-89.
- _____. 1975. The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and Its Relation to the Policy Process. New York: David McKay Co.
- _____. 1979. "Resource Mobilization and Strategy: A Model for Analyzing Social Movement Organization Actions." In The Dynamics of Social Movements, pp. 167-189. Edited by J.D. McCarthy and Meyer Zald. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.
- Gamson, William. 1968. Power and Discontent. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- _____. 1975. The Strategy of Social Protest. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- Gamson, Zelda and Levin, Henry M. 1984. "Obstacles to the Survival of Democratic Workplaces." In Worker Cooperatives of America, pp. 219-245. Edited by John Jackall and Henry Levin. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gerlach, Luther. 1982. "Movements of Revolutionary Change: Some Structural Characteristics." In Social Movements of the 60s and 70s, pp. 133-147. Edited by Jo Freeman. New York: Longman.
- Gerlach, Luther P. and Hine, V. H. 1970. People, Power and Change: Movements of Social Transformation. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Strauss, Anselm L. 1967. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gouldner, A. 1954. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: Free Press.

- Grossholtz, Jean. 1984. "Battered Women's Shelters and the Political Economy of Sexual Violence." In Families, Politics and Public Policy: A Feminist Dialogue on Women and the State, pp. 59-69. Edited by Irene Diamond. New York: Longman.
- Hansen, Karen. 1986. "The Women's Unions and the Search for a Political Identity." Socialist Review 86:67-95.
- Hart, Barbara. 1981. "Burn-out: A Political View." Aegis (Autumn):35-40.
- Jagger, Alison M. 1983. Feminist Politics and Human Nature. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Allenheld.
- Jamison, Michael. 1985. "The Joys of Gardening: Collectivist and Bureaucratic Cultures in Conflict." The Sociological Quarterly 26(4):473-490.
- Jenkins, J. Craig. 1983. "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements." Annual Review of Sociology 9:527-553.
- Jenkins, J. Craig. 1985. The Politics of Insurgency: the Farmworkers Movement of the 1960s. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jenkins, J. Craig and Perrow, Charles. 1977. "Insurgency of the Powerless." American Sociological Review 42:249-268.
- Johnson, John M. 1981. "Program Enterprises and Official Cooptation in the Battered Women's Shelter Movement." American Behavioral Scientist 24(6):827-842.
- Largen, Mary Ann. 1981. "Grassroots Centers and National Task Forces: A History of the Anti-Rape Movement." Aegis (Autumn): 46-52.
- Lindenfeld, Frank and Rothschild-Whitt, Joyce. 1982. Workplace Democracy and Social Change. New York: Porter Sargent Publishers.
- Mandle, Joan. 1981. Women and Social Change in America. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book Co.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 1973. "Time, Emotion and Inequality: Three Problems of Participatory Groups." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 9:351-368.
- _____. 1980. Beyond Adversary Democracy. New York: Basic Books.

- _____. 1982. "Fears of Conflict in Face to Face Democracies." In Workplace Democracy and Social Change, pp. 125-137. Edited by Frank Lindenfeld and Joyce Rothschild-Whitt. New York: Porter Sargent Publishers.
- McCarthy, John and Zald, Meyer. 1973. The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization. Chicago: General Learning Press.
- _____. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: a Partial Theory." American Journal of Sociology 82:1212-1239.
- McShane, Claudette and Oliver, John. 1978. "Women's Groups as Alternative Human Service Agencies." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 5:615-626.
- Newman, Katherine. 1980. "Incipient Bureaucracy: The Development of Hierarchies in Egalitarian Organizations." In Hierarchy and Society, pp. 143-163. Edited by Gerald Britan and Ronald Chen. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- O'Sullivan, Elizabeth. 1978. "What Has Happened to Rape Crisis Centers? A Look at Their Structures, Members, and Funding." Victimology 3(1-2):45-62.
- Pettigrew, Andrew. 1979. "On Studying Organizational Culture." Administrative Science Quarterly 24:570-581.
- Pittman, Karen, Burt, Martha R. and Gornick, Janet C. 1984. "The Internal Dynamics of Rape Crisis Centers." Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Rothschild-Whitt, Joyce. 1986. Cooperative Workplaces. London: Oxford University Press.
- Schechter, Susan. 1981-1982. "The Future of the Battered Women's Movement." Aegis (Autumn 1981):41-5; (Winter 1982):36-43.
- _____. 1982. Women and Male Violence. Boston: South End Press.

- Schilesinger, Melinda Bart and Bart, Pauline. 1982. "Coalition Work and Self-Identity: Working in a Feminist Illegal Abortion Collective." In Workplace Democracy and Social Change, pp. 173-179. Edited by Frank Lindenfeld and Joyce Rothschild-Whitt. New York: Porter Sargent Publishers.
- Simon, Barbara Levy. 1981. "Social Movements and Institutionalization: Rape as a Case Study." PhD dissertation, Byr Mawr College.
- Singh, Jitendra, Tucker, David and House, Robert J. 1986. "Organizational Legitimacy and the Liability of Newness." Administrative Science Quarterly 31:171-193.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1988. "The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalization in the Pro-choice Movement." American Sociological Review 53:585-606.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1989. "Stability and Innovation in the Women's Movement: A Comparison of Two Movement Organizations." Social Problems 36(1):75-91.
- Sullivan, Gail. 1982. "Funny Things Happen on Our Way to Revolution." Aegis (Spring):12-21.
- Taylor, Verta. 1983. "The Future of Feminism in the 1980s." In Feminist Frontiers, pp. 434-451. Edited by Laurel Richardson and Verta Taylor. New York: Random House.
- Tierney, Kathleen J. 1979. "Social Movement Organization, Resource Mobilization, and the Creation of a Social Problem: a Case Study of a Movement for Battered Women." PhD dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Tierney, Kathleen J. 1982. "The Battered Women's Movement and the Creation of the Wife Beating Problem." Social Problems 29(3):207-220.
- Weston, Kathleen M. and Rofel, Lisa B. 1984. "Sexuality, Class and Conflict in a Lesbian Workplace." Signs 9(41):623-646.
- Zald, Meyer and Ash, Roberta. 1966. "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change." Social Forces 44(3):327-340.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

Questionnaire I. [asked of administrators at the original twelve organizations]

1. Who is respondent? How long have they been with the organization? In what position/positions?
2. How old is the organization?
3. How big is the organization? How many staff? Full-time? Part-time? How many volunteers? How many clients/customers? How many members?
4. Has the size of the organization changed since its beginning?
5. Is the organization non-profit? Is it tax exempt?
6. How long has director been in that position? How long have the staff been with the organization?
7. Do the staff and volunteers have any part in the recruitment or hiring of the director? If so, what or how?
8. Is there a board of directors? How big? How are they recruited and selected? Do they receive any training? If so, what? Do the staff and volunteers have any part in this selection or training? How long do board members serve?
9. How are decisions made? If collectively, are all decisions made collectively? If not, which ones are? Who makes other decisions?
10. Has the decision-making procedures changed since the organization's beginnings? If so, when? Why? How?
11. Are there by-laws, policies, and procedures which define organizational and individual responsibilities? May I have copies of them?
12. Do you have specific procedures for resolving conflicts?
13. What types of internal conflicts arise? How are they dealt with? Are these reoccurring conflicts?
14. Where do your funds come from? What is your annual budget?
15. Have these sources of income been stable since the beginning of the organization?

13. Do any of the local media cover your fund-raising activities? If so, which newspapers, radio stations, or TV stations?
14. If you do get media coverage, what does it cover? Does it discuss your services or the goals of your organization in general or just events that you are involved with? How often do you get media attention? [e.g., once a month, once a year]
15. If you do get media coverage, do you solicit it or do the media come to you?
16. If you do not get media coverage, have you ever solicited it?
17. Would you categorize any of the media coverage you have had as positive or negative in scope?
18. Have you ever turned to the community in general for support [financial, political, volunteer]? If so, who do you go to?
19. Do you have a mailing list? If so, how often do you do mailings? Who is on this mailing list? What is it used for?

Questionnaire III. [asked of staff, board and volunteers]

1. What is your position here? [i.e., staff, volunteer]
What is your title?
2. What are your job responsibilities?
3. Do you have a job description which clearly outlines these responsibilities? Are there regular performance evaluations done by your supervisor?
3. How long have you been here? Are you full-time? Part-time? How many hours a week do you work?
4. Have you ever been involved with this organization in another capacity? If so, in what capacity?
5. Have you ever worked for/been involved with any similar organizations?
6. Why did you choose to work here? [e.g., just a job, have friends here, am committed to what the organization does, enjoy doing this type of work, other]
7. Is it different here than other places you have worked? If so, how? [e.g., more relaxed, more stressful, have more freedom, there's more flexibility, more hectic, feel I have more impact on what happens, friendlier, the work is more difficult, get more respect here, other]
8. Did you have certain expectations about working here before you came? What were they? What are your expectations now? [e.g., supportive environment, job would be stressful, be friends with other workers, be able to help people, work would be difficult, change social conditions, other]
9. How much control do you have over your job here? Are you allowed to adjust your work schedule to meet your personal needs?
10. Are there other people here that you can turn to when you feel "overwhelmed" with your particular job responsibilities? Will they assume some of these responsibilities temporarily?
11. Do you socialize with people you work with? [i.e., have lunch together, do things as a group, have friends here who are incorporated into the rest of your life]

12. Do the staff and volunteers socialize? How do staff and volunteers interact? Are they treated differently?
13. How are decisions made? Please describe.
14. Could you name three strengths and three weaknesses of this organization?
15. One thing I'm interested in is conflict. I believe that conflict is a fact of life, both in people's personal lives and in organizations, and that conflict can be both positive and negative. I also think that there are two basic ways that most people deal with conflict: a) they avoid it or b) they confront it. If you were going to place yourself on a continuum where 1=avoidance and 10=confrontation, where would you be? Tell me how you deal with conflict.
16. When you look at your past experiences, do you think that conflict is more often productive or nonproductive? In your personal life? In the organizations you have been involved with?
17. Can you tell me about any conflicts which have occurred in this organization in the past couple years [between Jan. 1988 and June 1989]? Could you describe it.....
18. What was the conflict about?
19. Who was involved?
20. How long did it last?
21. Do you think it affected the services the organization provides?
22. Do you think it affected the ability of the organization as a whole to pursue its goals?
23. How did it affect any other organizational plans?
24. Were other organizations/people in the community aware of the conflict? If so, how did this affect the organization's relationship with other organizations and the community?
25. Do you know if it affected the organization's funding?
26. Was an outside mediator or consultant called in to assist the organization during this period? [Has the

organization ever used outside consultants for any reason?]

27. How was the conflict resolved? Do you think it could have been resolved differently?

28. How did you feel about everything? Do you know how other people felt about it?

29. Did it affect your ability to do your job? Do you think it affected other people's ability to do their jobs?

30. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me? I know that these might have been difficult questions to answer; how are you feeling about this interview?

31. Can you give me names of other people who might have a different viewpoint than you do? [Perhaps someone who is not here anymore . . .]

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTORY MATERIALS

Letter of Introduction.

Mary Ann Barham
3117 NE 11th
Portland, OR 97212

281-9213

I am a graduate student in sociology at Portland State doing research for my master's thesis. My research is a study of a number of non-profit organizations in the Portland area. I have already interviewed the director about the organization in general and am now interviewing other staff members and volunteers. All the information I receive from you will be kept completely confidential.

If you have any questions or concerns about my research project please contact me at the above number or feel free to contact my advisor at Portland State: Johanna Brenner 464-3516.

Thank you very much for your willingness to give me your time and knowledge.

Informed Consent.

I, _____, hereby agree to serve as a subject in the research project on non-profit social service organizations conducted by Mary Ann Barham.

I understand that the study involves an interview which will last approximately 1 to 1 1/2 hours. It has been explained to me that the purpose of the study is to learn more about the functioning of non-profit social service organizations. I may not receive any direct benefit from participation in this study, but my participation may help increase knowledge which may benefit others in the future.

Mary Ann Barham has offered to answer any questions I may have about the study and what is expected of me. I have been assured that all information I give will be kept confidential and neither my name nor my identity will be used for publication or public discussion purposes.

I have read and understand the foregoing information and agree to participate in this study.

Date _____ Signature _____

If you experience problems that are the result of your participation in this study, please contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Committee, Office of Grants & Contracts, 303 Cramer Hall, Portland State University, 725-3417.

APPENDIX C

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

The following is a list of the number of interviews conducted at each organization.

<u>Organizations</u>	<u>No. of Interviews</u>
Feminist I	9
Feminist II	6
Feminist III	11
Alternative I	19
Alternative II	6
Mainstream I	8

APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTIONS OF CONFLICTS AT EACH ORGANIZATION

The following is a list of the conflicts which occurred at each organization in the study. It describes who was involved in the conflict, what the issues were, and what the outcome was.

Feminist I

(1) Conflicts occurred between the board and the African-American executive director and staff about how much autonomy the director was given. Many interviewees believed that it was racist on the part of the board to hire an inexperienced person for an administrative position and not give her any autonomy. The director resigned in early 1989. Interviewees also mentioned other women of color who had left the organization at approximately the same time.

(2) Conflicts occurred between lesbian and heterosexual staff members and volunteers. Lots of "trashing" occurred under the guise of concerns about "political correctness."

(3) An unknown "saboteur" stole records and destroyed computer files. Tension was high among all the organization's members. Some staff believed a disgruntled staff member or volunteer was responsible.

(4) A conflict between the executive director and the operations manager over job responsibilities lead to the resignation of the operations manager.

(5) Disagreements occurred among members over the political goals of the organization.

Feminist II

(1) Conflict occurred between the executive director and the entire staff over the director's style of leadership and the hiring of a staff member which the staff believed was incompetent.

(2) Conflicts occurred among the staff members because they believed one staff member was not performing her job.

Feminist III

(1) Conflicts occurred between a) the executive director and a faction of the board who supported her and b) the rest of the staff and board members over the director's

competence and a sexual relationship she was having with a volunteer/board member.

(2) A conflict between a staff member and the rest of the staff resulted in the termination of this particular staff member because of her supposed inadequate job performance.

(3) A conflict occurred between the staff and the board of directors about the exclusion of the staff from a long-range planning session.

(4) Conflicts occurred among the staff and board about the goals of the organization.

Alternative I

(1) A personality clash between two staff members resulted in one of their resignations.

(2) Conflicts occurred between minority groups at the organization.

(3) Conflicts occurred among members about programming changes.

(4) Conflicts occurred among members about staff hirings. Because of attempts to increase women and minority representation on the staff, hirings were often a source of conflict about appropriate "affirmative action" choices.

(5) Conflicts occurred between organizational members about how decisions were made. There was dissatisfaction among some members about the amount of power held by the board of directors.

(6) Conflicts occurred among members about "underwriting".

(7) Conflicts occurred among members about decision-making procedures.

Alternative II

(1) Conflicts between the organization's programs and the program directors affected staff and volunteers in the clinic.

(2) Conflicts in the organization at large about a sexual relationship between a program coordinator in another

part of the organization and another staff member affected staff and volunteers in the clinic.

Mainstream I

(1) Personality clashes occurred between various organizational members.

(2) Racial tensions occurred between minorities and other organizational members.